

IBS

VOLUME 8 OCTOBER

1986



# BIBLICAL STUDIES

FEB 4 1987

Volume 8

1986

Editor: Rev. Professor E.A. Russell  
Union Theological College  
Belfast BT7 1JT

Associate Editor: Professor Ernest Best  
The University  
Glasgow G12 8QQ

Assistant Editor: Mrs Margaret Bullock  
Union Theological College  
Belfast BT7 1JT

#### Editorial Advisory Panel:

Professor D.W. Gooding, 73 Myrtlefield Pk, Belfast  
Rev Dr David Hill, The University, Sheffield S10 2TN  
Dr J.G. McConville, Trinity College, Stoke Hill, Bristol  
Rev Professor J.C. McCullough, John Knox College, Dunedin  
Principal R.J. McKelvey, The Congregational College, Whalley  
Range, Manchester M16 8BP  
Rev Professor J.S. McIvor, Union Theological College  
Rev J. Murphy-O'Connor, L'École Biblique, Jerusalem  
Rev. J.S. McPolin, S.J., Milltown Park, Dublin 6  
Professor E. Nicholson, Oriel College, Oxford  
Rev Vincent Parkin, Edgehill College, Belfast  
Mr David Payne, Registrar, London Bible College, Green  
Green Lane, Northwood, Middlesex HA6 2  
Professor Jacob Weingreen, Trinity College, Dublin 2

---

#### Subscriptions:

1986 (inclusive of postage):

Individuals £6.25 sterling or 7.50 Irish pounds

Institutions £9.50 sterling 16 US dollars

(All subscriptions should be made payable to "Irish  
Biblical Studies" and addressed to the Assistant  
Editor)

Copyright © IBS 1986

## Contents

Donald P. Ker, Missionary Motivation in Paul: The Jewish Environment	162-178
Vincent Parkin, Exegesis of Mark 4: 10-12	179-182
E.A. Russell, "Antisemitism" in the Gospel of Matthew	183-196

## Reviews

Bruce Chilton, A Galilaean Rabbi & his Bible (D.R.G. Beattie)  
 N.K. Gottwald, The Hebrew Bible, A Socio-Literary Introduction  
 (A.D.H. Mayes); Paul Davis, God and the New Physics (J.T.  
 McCormack); W.K. Kilpatrick, Psychology & Seduction (V.  
 Parkin); F.J. Maloney, First Among the Faithful (J.R. Boyd);  
 A.Y. Collins (ed), Feminist Perspectives on Biblical  
 Scholarship (J.R. Boyd); J. Lee Magnus, Sense & Absence  
 (E.A. Russell); Roger Beckwith, The NT Canon of the NT  
 Church & its Background in Early Judaism (D.W. Gooding).

197-211

## Books Received

212

Saul of Tarsus was a Jew. Even when he became a Christian he never denied his Jewish identity. It is therefore natural that, when we start to consider his motivation to mission, especially among the Gentiles, we should first consider the attitude of his native Judaism to Gentiles, particularly because the Judaism of Paul's time is noted for its outreach to non-Jews.

1. The Old Testament Basis. Ferdinand Hahn notes that a fundamental element of missionary thought and action is a universalist understanding of God. Such an understanding may be traced throughout the Old Testament. It is true that at its outset the faith of Israel was particularly concerned with the relationship between Yahweh and his people. But even where the existence of the celestial deities in Canaan is not denied we quickly see that the superiority of Yahweh is asserted and his exclusive claim as the jealous God of Israel is stressed.

An enigmatic hint that Yahweh offers the nations not only judgment but salvation can be found in the account of the call of Abraham, in which comes the promise of blessing to all the nations of the earth.<sup>3</sup> The Yahwist author gives no precise interpretation of how this blessing is to be achieved, but it is to be mediated through Abraham and the chosen people whose history is now beginning.

Throughout their history the people of Israel lived not in isolation from the non-circumcised, but rather with the גֵּרִים in their midst. In the book of the Covenant we see legislation in favour of the גֵּר and a reminder<sup>4</sup> to the Israelites that they were once גֵּרִים in Egypt. At the same time the גֵּר is required to keep the Sabbath.<sup>5</sup> It is therefore understood that he stands in a specific relationship to Yahweh as the God of the people and tribe among whom he dwells. On occasion we can see that the גֵּרִים<sup>6</sup> were particularly involved with the cult service. Hence the Gibeonites were allowed to live among the Israelites as 'hewers of wood and drawers of water for the congregation and for the altar of the Lord' (Josh.9,27) while, later, Ezekiel protests bitterly about the admission of uncircumcised foreigners who are noted as keeping charge of the sanctuary. (Ezek.44,8).

It is, however, in the post-exilic writings that the relationship between Yahweh, Israel and the nations (as distinct from the resident aliens) is most thoroughly explored. Deutero-Isaiah, in writing of the Servant, outlines his mission in ch. 49vv1-6. As J.L. McKenzie comments, '... the mission of the Servant is clear.... it is to restore Israel, but this is said to be the lesser part of the mission. The servant is a means of light and salvation to the nations.... The fullness of Israel and the fullness of the nations both lie beyond the historical present, and it is to this fullness that the Servant's mission must look.'<sup>7</sup> Once again in Isaiah 56, 1-8 both eunuchs and 'foreigners who join themselves to the Lord' are promised full membership of the Israelite community.<sup>8</sup>

In Isaiah 60 we find envisaged a pilgrimage to Zion by the nations, which takes place because the community of Israel has been faithful in bearing witness. It is, however, in ch. 66, 18-21 that we find what C. Westermann describes as '.... the first sure and certain mention of mission as we today employ the term - the sending of individuals to distant peoples in order to proclaim God's glory to them.'<sup>9</sup> Once again this outward thrust is seen as the prelude to a pilgrimage by the nations to Zion.

Hahn objects that this passage cannot really be considered as mission insofar as it is the 'survivors of the nations' themselves rather than the people of Israel who are commissioned by Yahweh to bear witness.<sup>10</sup> This is a valid comment, and yet the increasing incorporation of such 'survivors' within the Covenant people (v.21) lessens the thrust of Hahn's distinction.<sup>11</sup>

It must, however, be recognised that the post-exilic thrust of the Old Testament is not entirely in the universalist direction. There seems to have been a long struggle, which was to continue through later Judaism, between segregationists and assimilationists. Thus the works of Ezra, Nehemiah and Haggai, for instance, are concerned with the reformation of both cult and city. In contrast the leaders of assimilationist opinion attack the theory of segregation through works such as the book of Jonah, which is 'a satirical portrait of a

segregationist, a petty person devoid of human feeling, who would prefer the destruction of a city to the loss of his reputation, and be no less angry at the death of a vine than he was at Yahweh's refusal to kill all the people of Ninevah.<sup>12</sup>

Thus the book of Jonah is more than simply a work to underline the 'freedom of divine dealings with the Gentiles',<sup>13</sup> and yet it cannot be used to construct a thorough-going scheme of mission in the Old Testament.

We must content ourselves, therefore, to say that in the Old Testament the seeds of missionary work are present, but<sup>14</sup> that they do not bear fruit in any thorough-going manner. We note too the conflict between 'assimilationist' and 'segregationist' which appears again in our studies of later Judaism.

2. The Nature of Judaism, and its Relationship to Hellenism. We are wrong to imagine that Judaism prior to and during the time of Paul's missionary work can be described simply. Within it were not only the tensions already noted but also strong elements of apocalyptic and mysticism. The influence of Hellenism, not only in the areas of the Diaspora but also in Palestine must be taken into account.<sup>15</sup>

Towards the close of this chapter we shall ask the question regarding Paul's place of upbringing, which may help us to assess something of the elements of Judaism which were most influential for him, but since we are first concerned to outline something of the Jewish Mission among Gentiles we must try to assess the extent to which Hellenistic values were being absorbed by Judaism.

Language is one means for judging the amount by which one culture has absorbed another, although it is not a decisive proof. Hengel notes that it can be demonstrated from the Zeno papyri that the Greek language was known in aristocratic and military circles of Judaism between 260 and 250 B.C. in Palestine.<sup>16</sup> He further suggests that even in the later victorious freedom fight of the Maccabees, Greek would not have been suppressed. Hengel does, however, note that after the construction of a Gymnasium in Jerusalem in 175 B.C. there developed a counter-movement among the scribes whose aim was the introduction of the whole people to the Torah. This

vement had explicitly anti-Hellenistic tendencies but, suggests Hengel (without further elaboration) the methods and forms of Greek educational theory were adopted.

J. Goldstein suggests that Hengel has far overestimated the opposition between Judaism and Hellenism.<sup>17</sup> He offers, not a definition of Hellenism, but some distinguishing features, which include the implication that when the Greeks are present, the knowledge among some of the Greek language, the development and spread of rational philosophies, high emotional epic, drama and lyric poetry, the educational pursuits of the Greek gymnasium and identifiable architectural designs. Goldstein notes that none of these features are specifically forbidden, and that the Jews would hold from the Torah that all were permitted. Goldstein further notices that the Jews invented no term of abuse for Hellenists equivalent to the Latin 'pergraecari' or 'Graeculus'. Whether we can go as far as Goldstein in his estimate of the acceptance of Hellenism in Palestine we do have to take Hengel's point that 'from about the middle of the third century B.C. all Judaism must really be designated 'Hellenistic Judaism' in the strict sense, and a better differentiation could be made between the Greek-speaking Judaism of Palestine and Babylonia.'<sup>18</sup>

We may approach this question from another angle if we consider factors which were common to all Jews.<sup>19</sup> Föerster comments on some of them. The Jews had, he states, been welded together by a common history, and their understanding of history as it had been moulded by the scriptures was vital. Those scriptures themselves were, since they contained both the history of this people and the Law to which it was subject, the chief reason for its existence. Circumcision was the external token of incorporation into this race.

Naturally there were those within Judaism who wished that tighter definitions than these might apply, but in general it can be seen that there was room for a variety of relationships with Hellenism which did not transgress these general principles. Yet it should not be imagined that Judaism was deeply fragmented. Rather, as W.D. Davies notes, the synagogue in Palestine and the Diaspora gave to Judaism an unmistakeable unity and coherence.<sup>20</sup>

We are accustomed to the thought that in the Diaspora Judaism had to exist side by side with other religions, and was thus open to scrutiny by them. But, as we are reminded in Schurer, Palestine was also a centre of paganism. 'For the Jew was in almost daily contact with pagan affairs, whether with persons or with commodities and objects which found their way into Palestine by way of trade and commerce. Thus the greater the subtlety with which cases of direct or indirect defilement through Gentile ways were settled, the more frequent was the risk of such defilement.'<sup>21</sup>

Schürer makes this comment in the context of the steps which the Pharisees and rabbis took to prevent pagan inroad. In particular stress was laid by them on the Mosaic prohibition of images and the notion that Gentiles were unclean because they did not observe the purity laws; but while Palestinian rabbis would have erected a 'stout dividing wall against Gentile customs and thus defended Judaism against pagan religion they failed to check Graeco-Roman culture which was, in course of time, increasingly assimilated by the Jews.'<sup>22</sup>

By way of contrast Schürer, in an appendix on Gentile participation in worship in Jerusalem, suggests that Gentiles, who were not proselytes or those who held any continuous interest in Jewish religion, nevertheless offered sacrifice as an act of courtesy towards the nation. He further thinks that the Jews and their priests had no reason to reject such gifts. While his evidence for this seems at times less than convincing his conclusion contains an important insight; 'In a sense, therefore, even the exclusive Temple of Jerusalem became cosmopolitan; in common with the renowned sanctuaries of the Gentiles it received the homage of the whole world.'<sup>23</sup>

We are thus presented with a picture in which attempts by Jews to win over Gentiles to their persuasion were entirely likely, given the social setting in which they were placed. While there was undoubtedly a school of thought that was concerned first of all to maintain and develop the pietistic practices of Judaism in isolation from outside influence there was also an openness to interaction which in turn led to proseletisation.

3. Evidence for Missionary Attitudes from Events and Non-Jewish Sources. One of the first hints which we receive from non-Jewish literature as to the extent of proselytising efforts comes from Valerius Maximus who reports that i

139 B.C. Cn. Cornelius Hispalus, praetor peregrinus, '.....compelled the Jews who had tried to infect Roman customs with the cult of Jupiter Sabazius, to return to their homes.'<sup>24</sup> It would seem that 'Sabazius', a minor Phrygian deity identified with Dionysius, is a confused rendering of 'Sabaoth'. An interesting insight into the way in which Jewish behaviour was perceived by some can be found in an extract from Horace's satires: 'When I have a moment to spare, I amuse myself with writing; this is one of those minor peccadilloes. If you don't excuse it a big band of poets will come to my rescue; for we are much more numerous and like the Jews will compel you to join our gang.'<sup>25</sup>

Horace is writing a generation after Pompey had brought considerable numbers of Jews to Rome in 62 B.C. following his eastern campaign.<sup>26</sup> Even before this influx there seems to have been an increasing Jewish community. Philo later claims that, under Augustus, 'the large district of Rome beyond the Tiber was owned and inhabited by Jews.'<sup>27</sup>

Josephus offers us both an estimate of the size of the Jewish community in Rome in A.D. 19, and also the influence which it had in the ruling classes. At that time 4,000 members of the Jewish community were conscripted for military service, and the rest were expelled from the city. Josephus notes the reason for this as being a confidence trick which was played by some Jewish scoundrels on a wealthy Roman lady of high rank who was also a Jewish convert.<sup>28</sup> Although we need not trust Josephus' reason as being the complete explanation for this event it does demonstrate that, even in this period, Judaism was attracting the Roman upper classes. Tacitus, in referring to the same event, mentions an escape clause to the exclusion order if one rejected faith.<sup>29</sup> His description of the conscripts as 'tainted with that superstition' would also suggest proselyte involvement. It seems, therefore, that the Roman authorities had by this time become alarmed at the success of Jewish influence among Roman citizens, and may have seen it as a threat to security. It is worth noting, however, that although this expansion took place the act of proselytising was not condemned at this time.<sup>30</sup>

Josephus offers us other insights into the extent of proselytising in his account of the attempt

on Damascus in A.D. 66 by Cestius Gallus. The Damascenes had herded the Jews into the Gymnasium. 'However they were afraid of their own wives who, all but a few, had adopted the Jewish cult.'<sup>31</sup> In Antiquities he represents the Empress Poppaea as sympathising with the Jews, although she was hardly a proselyte herself. Josephus terms her a 'worshipper of God', but her moral behaviour was not appropriate to Judaism.<sup>32</sup>

Later Roman references to Jewish influence include a comment by Juvenal on the corrupting influence of parental example. A father, who is a god-fearer, in turn has a son who goes further and becomes a full Jew by circumcision. Juvenal does not approve! Epictetus also refers to both god-fearers and proselytes in his attempt to encourage Stoics to live up to their profession,<sup>34</sup> while Dio Cassius, following Suetonius, suggests that Domitian put to death his own cousin, Flavius Clemens (who was consul), and kinswoman, Flavia Domitilla, on a charge of atheism, 'a charge under which many were condemned who had drifted into Jewish practices'.<sup>35</sup> It would seem unlikely that either were full proselytes, but their execution once again underlines the manner in which Judaism had affected the Roman ruling class, and also the threat which it was perceived to present.

Beyond the city of Rome one of the most famous conversions was that of King Izates II of Adiabene on the upper Tigris, together with his whole household. Josephus was especially proud of this triumph of missionary endeavour, which incidentally serves to show the various approaches which existed in Jewish missionary work regarding circumcisions.<sup>36</sup> In discussion with the Jewish merchant, Ananias, Izates wished to be circumcised, but was advised against this step by his mother, herself a Jewish proselyte, for fear that it might not be acceptable to all in Adiabene. Ananias concurred with this advice, commenting that Izates might worship God without circumcision if he would simply follow the liturgical practices of the Jews which were much more important than circumcision. It may be that Ananias was fearful for his own position had he advised circumcision which might later prove to be unpopular, but his comments may well represent the opinion which was

expressed on the subject throughout much of diaspora Judaism. In later contact with R. Eleazer, however, Eleazar underwent circumcision, and only then was properly considered a proselyte.

G.F. Moore comments that, rather than sending out missionaries, the Jews simply settled themselves in certain areas and thus exerted their influence.<sup>37</sup> They appropriated the language of those around them for trading reasons and then through the synagogue, which did not seem greatly unusual in the ancient world, won considerable interest. The success of this 'mission' must be seen in the light of a deep dissatisfaction with the State cults which was evident throughout the Roman empire at the time of Jesus. Judaism appealed, for it was a reasonable religion which at the same time demanded a total allegiance. Not that total allegiance was always possible. Collins suggests that 'strict monotheism would have been virtually impossible for anyone engaged in Roman public life'. He continues 'The Jews, in turn, did not always demand strict monotheism from the Gentiles', but it must be noted that such flexibility<sup>38</sup> hardly extended to those who became full proselytes.

As well as the evidence in Acts for Gentiles who had association with the Synagogues two other New Testament references to Jewish proselytising may be noted here. In Matt. 23, 15 Jesus refers to the activities of the rabbis who cross land and sea to make one proselyte. There is considerable discussion on this verse. On balance it is best understood as an authentic saying which refers either to the tremendous insistence of Palestinian Judaism on keeping the law (and thus opening the way for hypocrisy), or to the possibility that some further privilege or requirement was made for proselytes which was not in the law.<sup>39</sup> At any rate we need not doubt that Jesus noted the efforts which the Pharisees were investing in proselytising ventures.

In Romans 2, 17ff. Paul offers a critique of the Jewish missionary. His major point is that Jewish propagators of the faith are unable to live up to their own words. If this is taken to mean that in fact Jewish missionaries were living morally reprehensible lives, then Paul's criticisms are, as far as we know, unfounded.<sup>40</sup> He

may be quoting from the report or slander of another, or even giving an extreme example which he himself knew. Perhaps he is best understood as stressing the missionary's need of grace. But, and this is the point, the verses introduce us to possible approaches among Jewish preachers and suggest that at some point Paul had argued his case with them in person.

We have no way of estimating statistically the results of Jewish propaganda. But such evidence as we have adduced would suggest that it was considerable, that it provoked a degree of anti-semitic reaction in the Roman world, and that it did provide a setting for the expansion of Christian Missionary work. To corroborate this evidence we turn now to consider some of the attitudes which we find towards proselytes in Jewish literature.

#### 4. Evidence for Missionary Attitudes from Jewish Writings

The variation in approach to the question of mission among the Gentiles is as wide in the writings of later Judaism as it was in the Old Testament. Hahn notes correctly that, 'for wide circles of later Judaism there was no missionary inclination', and in particular that, 'we find no evidence, either in apocalyptic or in Qumran writings of winning over and converting the Gentiles'.

In Rabbinic Judaism we do receive a number of insights into the manner in which Gentiles were, or were not, admitted to Judaism, but even here our sources offer us difficulties. Since the Rabbinic writings are all collections which are dated after the fall of Jerusalem and the anti-Jewish legislation of 135 A.D. they may well reflect a harsher attitude to proselytes than that which actually prevailed at the time of Paul's ministry. Furthermore, as D. Daube points out, rules which originally had regard to missionary activities did in the course of time lose their specific character, and thus sayings which seem to have a general moral import may have in fact been intended as instructions in a missionary methodology.

Schoeps suggests that in Rabbinic Judaism there may have been a whole 'Derekh Eres' literature, although opinion on this varies.<sup>45</sup> Certainly the short tractates Derekh Eres Rabba and Derekh Eres Zuta contain enthusias

appeals from the school of Rabbi Aqiba to the Gentile world. Daube suggests that in these works the maxim 'A man should not be joyful among the weeping nor weep among the joyful...' might come direct from a missionary setting where it meant 'accommodate yourself to any type of people, in order to convert them'.<sup>44</sup>

This principle of accommodation can be traced in the approaches which come from Hillel's school of thought. He is seen advancing the basic principle 'Be of the pupils of Aaron....loving men and bringing them to the Torah'.<sup>45</sup> In marked contrast to the attitude of Shammai he is reported to have been ready to receive a Gentile as a proselyte in spite of his deficient readiness to learn the Torah. Along the same lines is the Mekhilta on Ex. 22,21 which speaks of Abraham, who once had described himself as a גר and was thus now the father of all proselytes. Had he been circumcised when he was a young man then it would be possible to convert to Judaism only at a young age. For this reason God delayed the conclusion of the covenant with him until he was ninety<sup>46</sup> nine years old so that the גר would not be excluded.

In Rabbinic Judaism the term גר comes to acquire a meaning different from that already noted in the Old Testament. Now the גר תושב may be identified with 'the alien who dwells in the land' although Schoeps notes, I think correctly, that later the term tended to be identified with the 'half proselyte'.<sup>47</sup> For them the more usual term is זרע פריה described by Schoeps as the mass of Gentiles won over by missionaries and expected to keep the most important commands. They are generally identified with the ὑποταγμένοι τοῦ θεοῦ in Acts. Clearly to be distinguished from both groups is the גר גמול who is a full proselyte. There was some discussion among the rabbis regarding the proper form of initiation for such, - in particular whether circumcision was necessary in addition to baptism, - but eventually the view of Eliezer ben Hyrcanus that<sup>48</sup> circumcision was required became the settled view.

Although the approach of the school of Hillel, that proselytes were to be welcomed and accommodated, was probably the favoured view of Rabbinic Judaism at the time of Paul we do receive strains of another approach.

Eliezer ben Hyrcanus expresses reluctance in thinking of proselytes because, he suggests, they are by nature bad, with their minds always inclined to idolatry. Commenting on Proverbs 14,34 he claims that all the charity and kindness done by the heathen is in fact counted to them as sin, because they only do it to magnify themselves.<sup>49</sup> More extreme rejection of proselytes may be found in the later Rabbi Helbos, who claimed<sup>50</sup> that they were as troublesome to Israel as the itch. However this appears to be an isolated opinion. In general true proselytes and native-born Israelites were equally defined as those who accepted the covenant, intended to obey the commandments and performed them to the best of their ability.

Rabbinic Judaism was in general only interested in full proselytes, and does not have a clear-cut opinion concerning the fate of those Gentiles who were 'God-Fearers'. Sanders notes that there were those who took both a positive and negative approach. He sums up the situation thus; '.....there is no one view of the situation of Gentiles which prevailed throughout the Tannaitic period. The general impression is that the Rabbis were not ungenerous except when special circumstances moved them to view Gentiles with bitterness. Even those who were of the view that righteous Gentiles would have a place in the world to come do not specify what a righteous Gentile is.'<sup>51</sup> Sanders develops the point, I think correctly, by stressing that the question which really animated the rabbis was 'How can we obey God who redeemed us and to whom we are committed?', and that there was relatively little concern with how one who was not born in the covenant enters it, or with the fate of those remaining outside.<sup>52</sup>

If we move from the world of the Rabbis to that of Diaspora Judaism we find a totally different type of literature, written with Gentiles particularly in mind. We know little of the religious or literary production of any Jewish community in the Diaspora outside Alexandria and so conclusions may only be drawn with caution, but in the work, not only of Philo but also in the Sibylline Oracles and other writings,<sup>53</sup> we have a literature designed to present Judaism to the Gentile world in an understandable and favourable light.

Kuhn comments that, in defining a Proselyte, Philo notes that he is one who has left country, friends and relatives, also patriarchal customs, and set himself under the Jewish constitution.<sup>54</sup> That circumcision is implied here would seem obvious. But while Philo does not depart from Jewish practice he does display the interest which we have noted to be lacking in the rabbis, and those who are content to express belief in one God without becoming fully absorbed into Judaism. Indeed Schoeps notes that the 'missionary propaganda of the time' was aimed, not at making Gentiles complete Jews but rather Noachides or God-Fearers, who retaining their distinctive position should be annexed to the Jewish communities.'<sup>55</sup>

It is most noticeable that Philo, while not denying that obedience to Jewish law could be dispensed with, continually laid more emphasis on the attitude of the believer. A fragment quoted by Kuhn explains this well, where it is expressed that the true proselyte is one, who is circumcised not merely in the foreskin but, in customs and desires and other passions of the soul.'<sup>56</sup>

V. Tcherikover has questioned whether in fact the Jewish Alexandrian literature was used for apologetics and missionary propaganda, as has generally been assumed.<sup>57</sup> He firstly suggests that the habit of reading books and preserving them grew only slowly, and that the very method of publication of literature, especially by Jews in a Greek world, meant that a widespread literature campaign for Judaism, as has at times been assumed, is impossible. Commenting that, for Greek readers, the Jewish material could only make sense if they were interested in the Greek Bible itself Tcherikover then notes that we have no record of the Greeks reading the Bible before the Christian period. Regarding the content of such literature, while agreeing that polemics against paganism and the praise of Judaism are the main contents, Tcherikover believes that these are directed, not so much to the pagan community as to the Jewish community itself, since 'those Jews who approached Hellenistic civilisation by all possible ways and were influenced by it in their way of life and thought, found it easier to cling to Judaism as long as they knew that Judaism stood on an equal level with Hellenism.'<sup>58</sup> The polemical passages in particular are

couched in language which would speak to Jew rather than to Greek, insofar as they represent a Jewish misunderstanding of paganism. Through examining the place, the time and the historical conditions of Alexandrian literature Tcherikover concludes that it was created not in order to exhibit certain ideas to the outer world, but to give expression to the intricate problems which were developing in the Jewish community itself and which attracted the interest of its members.

While these insights are of value, and in particular make us question the extent of the use of literature and knowledge of the Bible among non-Jews the fact remains that Judaism spread in the Hellenist world. It can be argued that the Septuagint itself has a missionary slant. Schoeps points, for example, to Proverbs 4,27 where the translation reflects the Hellenistic image of the 'two ways' as possibilities of human existence. We may not speak as confidently as Schoeps about 'the chief representatives of the missionary idea' whom he finds in the authors of Judaic Hellenism, nor need we deny any missionary interest there.

##### 5. Paul's origins within Judaism.

We have attempted to trace the attitudes to mission among the Gentiles which can be found in the Judaism of Paul's day, and noted that they varied. There were some discussions on the value of circumcision, while interest in Gentiles was more dominant in some areas than in others. Nevertheless we take it as an established fact that there was considerable mission among Gentiles in First Century (A.D.) Judaism, albeit of a non-systematic nature.

This very lack of system makes it difficult for us to assess how far missionary attitudes which Paul may have met in his Jewish upbringing were in themselves important motivating factors. But even as we attempt any tentative answer to this question a further issue arises. We have noted that, while every part of Judaism was influenced to some extent by Hellenism, there was a difference between 'Diaspora' and 'Palestinian' Judaism. We must ask in which broad area of Judaism Paul's own upbringing took place.

C.G. Montefiore introduces us to this debate with the assertion that Paul was a Jew of the Diaspora unacquainted with the best Rabbinic Judaism of Palestine and familiar only with a Diaspora approach, 'which was colder, less intimate, less happy because it was poorer and more

imistic'.<sup>60</sup> While Montefiore's analysis of the  
tive merits of Palestinian and Diaspora Judaism  
not detain us, other than to say that the contrast  
een them is drawn with unfair sharpness, his assump-  
that Paul's upbringing was influenced most heavily  
Tarsus is important. Tarsus was a typically  
enistic city, favourably situated for trade and  
erce. It was the intellectual centre of a flourish-  
stoic school and it was a place of religious syncre-  
where Judaism was a minority. An upbringing in such  
nvironment would not only have coloured Paul's  
tude to Judaism. Even more it would have been  
uential in his attitudes to Gentiles, although we  
not necessarily presume for Tarsus the relationships  
h took place in Alexandria.

An entirely different position in the discussion  
rding early environmental influences upon Paul is  
ed by W.C. Van Unnik.<sup>61</sup> Noting forcefully, and valid-  
that there is very little hard evidence in this debate  
ases his case on ἀνατεθραμμένος in Acts 22, 3 which,  
sserts, refers not only to schooling but to Paul's  
life from an early age. Van Unnik suggests that  
interpretation is confirmed by Acts 26, 4 & 5. It  
of course, difficult to build a firm case from three  
es in Acts. Bornkamm suggests that 'this all too  
rly reveals Luke's inclination to make Paul an out-  
out Jew and connect him with Jerusalem as closely and  
y as possible'.<sup>62</sup> Bornkamm further comments that,  
Jerusalem been Paul's place of upbringing he would  
tainly' have mentioned it in his account of himself  
hil.3,5. But these objections to Van Unnik's thesis  
both unconvincing. Is it not just as likely that  
speech of Acts 22 at least reflects a known tradition  
erning Paul while Bornkamm's comments on Philippians  
titute a particularly weak 'argumentum ex silentio'.  
The case is not proved, because it cannot be.  
rtheless Jerusalem seems quite possibly to be the  
likely environment in which Paul's early attitudes  
shaped. Because of the interpenetration of Hellenism  
Judaism even in Palestine we may not presume that  
had any particular attitude to Gentiles before his  
ersion, but we may not ascribe to him the approach  
ne like Philo.

One further question remains. Was Paul already a

missionary before his conversion, taking part in a Jewish proselytising campaign? Among those who suppose this to be the case are Schoeps<sup>63</sup> and Bornkamm.<sup>64</sup> Once again the evidence is somewhat elusive. In part it consists, I think, of the unspoken presumption that the Christian Paul could not have taken such an overwhelming interest in the Gentiles if, before he met with Christ he had not also been concerned about their fate. More substantial evidence may be found in Gal. 5, 11 where Paul asks *εἰ περιτομὴν ἔτι κηρύσσω τί ἔτι διώκομαι*. From this E. Barnikol assumed that before his Christian baptism Paul had practised the calling of a Jewish preacher of circumcision.<sup>65</sup> However the juxtaposition of two *ἔτι(ς)* means that this interpretation is not necessarily implied. It would be tempting to draw a picture of Paul being heavily involved before his conversion in a Jewish proselytising campaign. This would certainly help us to see his later struggles with circumcision and the law in a new light. But we simply do not have enough evidence to draw any conclusions. No doubt Paul himself was fully aware of the variety of approaches in his native Judaism to the question of Gentile salvation. That he undertook his own work surrounded by this debate is surely significant. But we may not be more precise than that.

## Notes

1. F. Hahn, Mission in the NT, London 1965, 18
2. eg in Ps 82
3. Genesis 12.3
4. See eg Exodus 22.20f
5. Exodus 20.10; 23.12
6. Deut 5.14; 16.10f; 16.13
7. J.L. McKenzie, II Isaiah, Anchor Bible 1968, 105; cf also P.R. Ackroyd, Exile and Restoration, London 1968, 136
8. As McKenzie notes, this is in contrast to efforts by some in the community, notably Ezra and Nehemiah to preserve themselves from religious and cultural assimilation.
9. C. Westermann, Isaiah, London 1966, 425
10. F. Hahn, op.cit. 20
11. Cf Westermann, op.cit. 426

- M. Smith in the Cambridge History of Judaism Vol 1, ed. Davies and Finkelstein, Cambridge 1984, 248  
Hahn's opinion seems unnecessarily dismissive (op.cit. 20)  
Cf Hahn's useful note on J. Blauw, Gottes Werk in dieser Welt. Grundzüge einer biblischen Theologie der Mission 1961 (op.cit. 20)  
Cf espec M. Hergel, Judaism and Hellenism, London 1973  
Hergel, op.cit. 103  
J. Goldstein, 'Jewish Acceptance and Rejection of Hellenism' in Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, Vol II (ed E.P. Sanders 1981 65ff  
op.cit. 104  
W. Förster, Palestinian Judaism in NT Times (ET) 1964, 141ff  
W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, London 1948; see also IDB, N York 1979 Vol 4, 81  
E. Schürer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, (rev and ed by G. Vermes, M. Black) Vol 2, Edinburgh 1979 81  
ibid, 84  
ibid, 309-313  
"Memorable Deeds and Sayings", 1.3,3  
"Satires" 1.4. 139-143 (from M. Whittaker, Jews and Christians: Graeco Christian Views, Cambridge 1984)  
See M. Smallwood, The Jew under Roman Rule, Leiden 1976, 27f  
Leg.155  
"Jewish Antiquities", xviii, 65-84  
"Annals" ii, 85.5                      30. M. Smallwood op.cit. 602  
"Jewish War", II,ii,20                      32. "Antiquities", X vii 11  
"Satires", 14, 96-106                      34. "Epictetus" 2.9,19-21  
""Epitome of Xiphilinus" 57.14, 1-2                      36. "Antiquities" XX 34-48  
G.F. Moore, Judaism (Cambridge 1927), Vol 1, 323ff (espec N.324)  
J. Collins, Between Athens and Jerusalem (NYork 1983), 167  
See ch.2.21 for this discussion                      40 Cf C.K. Barrett, Romans  
London 1957, 56  
Hahn, op.cit. 21                      42. D. Daube, The NT and Rabbinic Judaism  
London 1956, 336ff  
H.J. Schoeps, Paul, the Theology of the Apostle in the light of Jewish Religious History, London 1961, 223  
D. Daube, op.cit. 339-340 If this is the case then Paul, in being made "all things to all men" (1 Cor 9.20f) is simply following Jewish missionary practice.  
Quoted by Moore, op.cit. 342 from Abct.1.12

46. Quoted by Schoeps, op.cit.228
47. 226f
48. On the discussion see N.J. Eleney, "Conversion, Circumcision and the Law" NTS 20, 1974 328-333; and J. Nolland, "Uncircumcised Proselytes", JStJ 12, 1981, 173-194
49. Cf E.P. Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism, London 1977, 208
50. b.Jeb. 47b, quoted by K.G.Kuhn, "Proselyte" (TDNT VI, 1968, 738)
51. E.P. Sanders, op.cit. 210 52. ibid, 211
53. Cf OT Pseudepigrapha, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, London 1983, 322
54. Kuhn, op.cit. 732 55. Cf H.J. Schoeps, op.cit. 225
56. Kuhn, op.cit. 732
57. V. Tcherikover "Jewish Apologetic Reconsidered", Eos, Commentarii in Aetatis Philologiae Polonia, Vol 48, 1956, 169ff
58. ibid, 180 59. Schoeps, op.cit. 223
60. C.G. Montefiore, Judaism and St. Paul, London 1914, 93
61. W.C. Van Unnik, Tarsus or Jerusalem - the City of Paul's Youth (ET) 1962
62. G. Bornkamm, Paul (ET), London 1971, 3
63. Schoeps, op.cit. 219
64. Bornkamm, op.cit. 12
65. E. Barnikol, Die vor-und frühchristliche Zeit des Paulus, Kiel 1962, quoted by Schoeps from 18ff.

The Rev Donald Ker, Methodist Chaplain at Trinity College Dublin, holds an Honours Degree in Classics (Trinity College) and an Honours degree in Divinity (Queen's University) and a Master of Theology (Queen's University) specializing in New Testament. This article represents an abstract from his M. Th thesis.

Vincent Parkin

can be confident that when Mk wrote his gospel in Greek, he wrote this passage in the words in which we have it, and the verses occupied their present position. But there are good reasons for thinking that their position is due to editorial activity, and that the verses came to Mk from a source different from that of the rest of the chapter. The phrases "when he was alone", "those about him with the boat", "those outside" and the word musterion (mystery RV, RSV) are not found elsewhere in the gospel, and "all things are done in parables" necessitates a meaning for "parables" different from that which it bears anywhere else in the NT.

Further, there are awkwardnesses about people and situations. In vv 1 and 2 there is a crowd which Jesus addresses from a boat. In v36 there is still the crowd which Jesus addresses from behind when he crosses the lake in a boat. But in vv 41-43 there is no crowd and no boat without there having been some indication of change of venue. These verses not only seem to have had an origin different from that of the rest of the chapter, they themselves show signs of mixed origin. "And he said to them" (v11) is, as Jeremias pointed out, one of Mk's typical phrases linking together different units, cf 2.27;4.2,21,24; 6.10;7.9;8.21

v11  
Verses 11,12 were then probably a separate unit, and v10 may have been originally the introduction to the interpretation of the Sower, and was adapted for its present position by changing a singular parabolē into a plural to fit "parables" in v11. This meant that although the Hebrew word meshal, translated "parable", had a wide range of meanings (proverbs, riddles, similes, similitudes, dark saying), the parables of v11, in their context in which Mk put them, were thought of only as parables like that of the Sower.

This in turn affected the understanding of mustērion. For the mystery probably was, as in Jewish apocalyptic, God's secret which had been hidden from men but now had been revealed. To those chosen to receive this revelation the secret was an open secret. The content of the mystery was that God's revelation had come to men in the person of Jesus. Jesus and his contemporaries did not recognize this because the truth

was hidden from them by the injunctions to silence which veiled his actions (1.25,44) and by the mysterious stories (parables) in which his message was presented (4.34). But some of Mk's readers did not fully understand his use of "secret". Mt and Lk both altered Mk's account to read "secrets" (plural), so making the word refer to the esoteric truths hidden in the details of the story (understood as allegory) of the parable. No doubt other early readers of Mk made mentally the same "correction" as Mt and Lk.

Probably some readers thought of mystery in terms of the mystery cults of their day, in which participation in, and knowledge of, the sacred rite was limited to those who had been initiated.

Some of Mk's readers may also have been familiar with Paul's use of mystery of the hardening of God of part of Israel (Rom.11.25). This fitted admirably with the view that Jesus prevented the Jews from understanding the truth by hiding it in enigmatic stories. It was easy for the reader to give the verses contemporary relevance. "Those about him with the twelve", represented the Christian community and "those outside" were the unbelievers who opposed them.

Mk does not identify the source of the quotation in v12 and in this it is like a number of his quotations from scripture. But even without identification it would be recognized as a prophetic oracle because of its oratorical style. Since therefore the obduracy of the Jews and of the temporary unbelievers was in fulfilment of prophecy, it was recognized as having been divinely ordained.

It has been stated that "The Semitic mind was notoriously unwilling to draw a sharp dividing line between purpose and consequence" (2). But it is improbable that many of Mk's readers were familiar with the workings of the Semitic mind since they were ignorant of the Aramaic language, as we know from Mk's translating Aramaic words for their benefit at 5.41 and 7.34. It is therefore unsafe to suppose that they took hina in v12 to indicate consequence. It is much more likely that they understood it in its usual sense as indicative of purpose, and that this understanding was reinforced by the mēpote clause. We may therefore disregard the possibility that mēpote meant "perhaps", as it does 2 Tim.2.25. Like hina it denotes purpose, "In order that should not be forgiven".

readers concluded that Jesus, who had revealed the knowledge of God's plan to his followers had, in fulfillment of scripture, hidden that truth from "those outside" pragmatic stories, so that they should not understand and remain unforgiven.

What did vv11,12 mean before Mk put them into their context, and how and when did they originate? According to Jeremias the logion is early and originated in Palestine, because of the antithetic parallelism of 11b, the presence of the divine name by the employment of the passives "been given" and "be forgiven", and the conformity of the logion with the Targum against both the Hebrew text and the LXX. /3 This is consistent with the tradition that Jesus is the speaker, as he is in every reference in the Gospels to this and similar passages (cf Mt 13.13-15; Lk 8.9f; 9.49; 12.39f; Mk 8.17)

There is a serious objection to regarding Jesus as the speaker: it is unthinkable that he should have deliberately misled some of his hearers from God's forgiveness! But if, as we have said, purpose and consequence were not sharply distinguished by Semites we may feel that what appears to be intended in v12 is actually a description of consequence. And the difficulty of the saying is further reduced if we accept the view of Jeremias that the Aramaic word underlying mēpote understood in the Targum of Isaiah 6.10 as "unless". This will give to the clause the meaning "Unless they turn and will forgive them".

It may be, however, that the best evidence we have of the way in which some Semites understood these supposed words of Jesus is provided by Paul, a "Hebrew born of Hebrews" (Phil 3.5).

In 2 Cor 4.3f Paul attributed the blindness of unbelievers to Satan (the god of this world) but in Rom 11.8 he said "God gave them eyes that should not see." So the immediate cause of the blindness of unbelievers was Satan, instead of this frustrating God's plan of salvation, it was actually part of his plan. (We may compare 2 Cor 12.7 where the thorn in the flesh, an angel of Satan, served a protective purpose in protecting Paul from over-elation.) If we had known that Jesus had described his rejection by the Jews in the words of Isaiah 6.9f, he would have recognized that the rejection was firmly within the purpose of God, but he did not have regarded Jesus as the immediate cause of the rejection, rather, as in Mk 4.15, the one who snatched away

the word so that no fruit was borne was Satan.

Jesus also rejected the view that he was doing the work of Satan, as some had blasphemously suggested (Mk 3.22-26). He who had summoned men to repent (Mk 1.15) would not seek to prevent them from repenting. It was Satan, not Jesus, who was divided against himself! So the words of Jesus, adapted from Isaiah 6.9f, were more than poetic and sorrowful or indignant recognition of the effect of his work. They were a declaration that both his work and its consequent rejection were within the sovereign purpose of God.

In Jesus' free quotation from Isaiah 6.9f first place is given to those who fail to see what they see, unlike the Hebrew text and the LXX where failure to understand what is heard comes first. And in the similar passage in Mk 8.17f those who had failed to understand the sign of the loaves are first reproved for their lack of vision. So, in speaking of those who had rejected him, Jesus was referring not just to those who failed to understand the message. He was speaking of those for whom all that he did as well as what he said was a tissue of riddles or parables.

It is not possible to say exactly when Jesus spoke the words. It could have been at any time when rejection by the majority was clear. Perhaps the recognition that, in contrast to the misunderstanding of the many, the secret of the kingdom had been granted to the disciples (Cf Lk 13.3) suggests a time after Peter's confession (Mk 7.27-30). The saying could appropriately stand in close relation with the passion, when the simultaneous operation of God's will and the power of evil in the same events is in sharpest focus. "The Son of Man goes as it is written of him, but woe to man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed. (Mk 14.21)"

The Rev Vincent Parkin is a past Principal of Edgehill Theological College, now retired but continuing a part-time lectureship in New Testament.

#### Notes

1. J. Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, 11f
2. G.F.D. Moule, An Idiom Book of the NT, 142
3. Jeremias, *op.cit.* 11f
4. *ibid*, 15

Antisemitism" in the Gospel of St. Matthew \*

E.A. Russell

In 1975, an American Scholar, Dr Rosemary Ruether, wrote a book entitled "Faith and Fratricide". In it she insisted that anti-Jewish trends were in the NT from the very beginning. This, she claimed, was supremely true of two Gospels, Matthew and John. The book was influential in a number of significant areas eg Dr Gregory Baum ten years previously had argued that anti-Jewish trends were always peripheral to the NT, accidental and not grounded in the NT ("Is the New Testament anti-semitic? 1965) writes in the foreword to Dr Ruether's book that he has abandoned his previous stance and that he now sees these anti-Jewish trends as more basic and central. It was this kind of claim that initially prompted my inquiry into the Gospel of St Matthew to see how far such an interpretation was justified or otherwise.

Another preliminary remark should perhaps be made by way of clarification of the description "Antisemitism". Antisemitism had however hardly emerged at the time of the writing of the Gospel ie the fourth quarter of the first century of the Christian era. /2 Far from speaking of "Antisemitism" in the Gospel, it could be insisted that the church of St. Matthew's day was still linked with Judaism /3 ie it is a church within Judaism,. Hostile attitudes are there but they are directed to both sections of Judaism, that which insists Jesus is the Messiah and that section which denies such identification. At the time the church remained a mere appendage of Judaism. As time went on it was becoming more and more conscious of its separate identity over against Judaism and thus we are, to some extent, justified in speaking of "Antijudaism". Yet such a term of "Antijudaism" could apply both ways. If the claim that Jewish-Christian is correct that the only true Jew is the one who acknowledges Jesus to be the Christ, then the new Judaism embodied in Christianity and all opposition to it from this point of view could presumably be called "Antisemitism". The basic point at issue could be: what is it that constitutes the true Jew. /4

The theme however is not "Antijudaism" but "Antisemitism". The description is a recognition of the historic fact that the teachings of the Gospel of Matthew have, over the centuries, contributed to an extension and intensification of antisemitic attitudes. Such elements are not always properly understood

or properly used if they are. A prejudice that exists is not always scrupulous in the way it uses material that may suit its purpose. Yet throughout the history of the church misunderstanding of what Matthew has to say has again and again given rise to distortions and it is in relation to such possible misunderstandings - if such indeed they are - that this paper is offered.

From the moment of writing, it has to be stressed that Matthew's Gospel was a very influential document. Associated with its writing may well have been an important school of early church thinkers /5 and an important church. /6 It could cater for the catechetical and liturgical needs in a way that the other gospels could not. /7 Unlike Mark and Luke it was associated directly with an apostle and contained the promise of Jesus to found his church. No other Gospel links the OT so closely with the details of the life of Jesus by the formula, "that it might be fulfilled". /8 Again, while Matthew has emphases relating to the mission to Judaism (Mt 10.5; 15.24), it was also concerned with the Gentile mission (Mt 12. 1-12; Mt 28.18-20). There can be no doubt that this Gospel was well-equipped to play an important role in the life and witness of the church.

Further, Matthew develops in history into one of the authoritative books of the church. It became, in other words, "canonical", one of the twenty-seven books of the NT accepted as the rule of faith for the Western church and this without difficulty from a very early stage. Other of the twenty-seven had great difficulty in getting accepted but this was never true of Matthew. It stood

on the highest level of authority and not unrelated to this was the persistent tradition that it was the earliest Gospel.

The authority of the Gospel was extended of course to infallibility, to plenary inspiration, and to the belief that it expressed the divine will for mankind. Not all will accept such a view even within the Christian church but for most churchmen that Gospel of Matthew must still be authoritative to a high degree.

Thus the more influence attributed to Matthew within the church, the greater the force of any latent or open anti-Jewish prejudice it may contain. Yet if our quest is for possible antisemitic elements, we must keep in mind the total perspective of the Gospel. A section,

example, that is found most difficult for readers is where Jesus delivers a concerted attack on Pharisees and scribes in ch.23 in terms that recall the OT prophets: "Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites...". Some have sought to alter the translation "Woe" to "Alas for you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites" but would retain "Woe" for the prophets without being fully aware of a certain inconsistency. One cannot escape the emphasis where the solemn phrase, "Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites" is repeated no less than seven occasions. Yet this is only a section which makes up perhaps a mere two per cent of the total material of the Gospel. To make it a basis of judgment without keeping in mind its relation with the rest of the Gospel material is to create a distortion of the kind we are trying to avoid. /9 It is not a fragment isolated from the rest of the synoptic Gospels but is firmly rooted in the Q source tradition. It appears to be a section constructed from Q and Matthew's other sources. This appears to have taken place elsewhere in the Gospel, e.g. in the Beatitudes, the Lord's Prayer and in the Parables. /10

The main conflict emerges in relation to Jesus as might be expected. It has its basis firmly in the tradition and there are few who would doubt its authenticity. /11 It was inevitable that if there were those who confessed that Jesus was "the Christ, the Son of the living God" (16.16), such confession would run up against the authoritative interpreters of the Law for "orthodox" Judaism, the Pharisaic scribes. /12 The opening sentence expressed in titular form announces the theme of the Gospel, "The book of the history of Jesus Christ, son of David, son of Abraham." So the theme of the Gospel is also a confession of faith. This is Jesus, the Messiah of the Jewish line and firmly within the traditions of Judaism.

3. The nature of the faith which forms the background of the Gospel is a fully articulated one. Such a faith would have been nurtured, over some fifty years or so, within the services of worship, in acts of prayer and devotion to Jesus or in acts of witness for mutual edification or in missionary activity to the whole world. Such a self-conscious faith is hardly what one expects to find in the early years of the disciples' fellowship with Jesus. There the disciples are pictured, sometimes in faith, and sometimes out of it, sometimes confessing and sometimes denying. They are never quite certain who Jesus is

and even their most profound insights seem too fleeting to support them in moments of testing. /14

In emphasizing the self-conscious and firm nature of this faith, we are suggesting that over against this the way of non-faith is more clearly understood. The church is on its guard against all those forces that destroy the faith of the community and we must be prepared to see in any attitudes of life or conduct that it attacks something which it discerns as a danger to its own survival. Thus the lines of contrast between those who represent the way of non-faith and who may constitute such a danger and those who are in the way of faith are much more sharply drawn than they might have been in the days of Jesus.

There is little doubt that the way of non-faith for Mt is best represented by the scribes and Pharisees, though of course not exclusively by them. The better righteousness is set over against the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees and must be greater. (5.20) It is a claim for inner reality in the matter of human relations and personal piety. It is not the characteristic of true religion to advertize its piety to men. This is no real heart religion. At various points we find Mt introducing the word "Pharisees" where it is absent from parallel accounts in the tradition. /15 It is done almost mechanically, unthinkingly at times. It even becomes representative of a way of life that is hostile to Jesus. It could perhaps be done by someone who knew the Pharisees only at a distance in time or space and for whom the term had become a stylized way of speaking of conduct that the disciple must not follow.

Mt does not attempt to soften the image of the Pharisees as he might on reflection easily have done. After all, it is never true to declare a whole party evil or good and it could be that the story of Nicodemus represents a qualification of such a point of view (John 3.1ff) There are elements of good and bad of course in every group and the final redactor (or his source) must surely have been aware of this. Parts of the other Gospels can tell us of sympathetic Pharisees eg inviting Jesus for a meal /16 or of Joseph of Arimathea (Mk 15.43) /17 This however is never the case in Matthew. In every case the Pharisees are presented in a hostile context. In Mt's Gospel alone are the Baptist and Jesus brought

er in their description of the Pharisees as "generation  
ers." (3.7;12.34;23.33) In Luke, the only other gospel  
to have the phrase, the description is only to be found  
lips of the Baptist (3.7) but addressed to the crowds  
t the "Pharisees and Sadducees." The phrase may have  
ped within the tradition from its usage by the Baptist  
expression on the lips of Jesus or perhaps it was a  
phrase of both if Jesus was greatly influenced by the  
t as he appears to have been.

in, we have no hint in the other Gospels that the Phar-  
have anything to do with the charge that Jesus carried  
s exorcisms in league with Satan. Mark has "scribes";  
fers the vague "some of them" (14.15) / 18 Yet on  
casions Mt records the charge on the lips of the  
ees and this serves to make emphatic the conflict  
n Jesus and the Pharisees in Mt. If the phrase "scribes  
arisees", repeated in the sevenfold woes, means "Phar-  
scribes" then it is the learned representatives of  
arisees who are charged.

may be that this situation of opposition to the Phar-  
reflects, to some extent, the situation of Mt's day. / 19  
the fall of Jerusalem the Pharisees became dominant  
eir hostility to the church more pronounced (No inst-  
nal authority cares to have its authority flouted).  
ossible that steps were being taken to exclude Jewish  
ians from active participation in the synagogue worship  
the terms of excommunication may not yet have been  
ated. It is claimed that, at the time of the final  
ion of the Gospel, Jewish measures against Christians  
ed controversy, propaganda, exclusion from the syn-  
, persecution and even death. Such active oppos-  
would naturally constitute a real threat to the church  
us himself, in a saying peculiar to Mt in the NT,  
fer to the extraordinary zeal of the Pharisees in  
sing sea and land to make one convert (23.15) / 20  
missionary zeal would not merely be concerned to  
the boundaries of Judaism among non-Jews. It would  
cerned to win back those who had defected, in their  
From Judaism. They may not have been as aggressive  
in his attempt to arrest those who had given them-  
over to Jesus as the Christ. / 21 Yet the concern  
ere Thus by his clear stand over against the  
ees Mt is repudiating these efforts as an act of

protection for those Jewish Christians who felt drawn back to the old securities and to those who had exercised such authority in former days. But the Pharisees need not be divorced from the unbelieving Judaism which they represent and which is seen as a unity. /22 Jesus is shown to have a primary concern for his own people, the Jews and it is only rarely, and in exceptional circumstances that he is deflected from this. His words are "I have been sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (15.2). A striking example of his commitment to the Jewish mission is especially brought out in the severely stringent account of the interview with the Canaanite woman where the reluctance of Jesus to engage in any kind of Gentile mission is brought out in a somewhat shocking way (Mt 15.25-28 and p

We have attempted, however inadequately, to explain in various ways the opposition to the Pharisaic scribes in Mt's Gospel and if they are seen as representing Judaism as a whole then the indictment becomes unfair. It can be eased by thinking of such scribes as those likely to be the most hostile to the church and most able to express it effectively and therefore the opposition that is in mind in Mt's Gospel can then be an attempt to win the Jewish people while setting the authorities apart. Such scribes are, however, not the only ones to be arraigned. Jesus does not spare the Sadducees nor the chief priests as representative authorities. Is it because, given the privilege of leadership and therefore the greater responsibility, they inevitably must bear the burden of the indictment, especially in the light of their failure. While there is an active tendency in the tradition which continually strives to present the opponents of Jesus as "scribes and Pharisees" /23 there is also evident a tendency to group together typical opponents of Jesus eg Sadducees are grouped rather oddly with Pharisees. /24 The Sadducees appear on only one occasion without the Pharisees and in connection with a question to Jesus about the resurrection (Mt 22.23f). Again, whereas the Sadducees are mentioned only on one occasion in Mk (12.18) and Lk (20.27), Mt mentions them on eight occasions, five of them in ch 16 and all of them in hostile contexts. The chief priests are mentioned in various contexts with the elders (16.21;21.23;26.3,47; 27.1,3,12,20,41) or the scribes (2.4;16.21;20.18;21.15;27.41) or the Pharisees (21.45;27.62) or "the whole Sanhedrin" (26.59)

their own (27.6) - all of these are in hostile contexts, representative of the authorities and yet united with unlikely odds over against Jesus. It may be that the early tradition that developed was unconcerned with possible awkwardnesses of the groupings. It was sufficient that they had a share in Jesus' death. It would seem then that Mt may not be concerned about the precise situation in history. His concern is with the various groups responsible for the decision to put Jesus to death as handed down in tradition. The severest charges, however, are directed against the Pharisaic scribes, and it would appear that Mt (or his tradition) constructs ch.23 from Q and his special sources, mounting an unusually severe attack and high lighting where it finds the real challenge to the church (vide supra) where we are then to say that such leaders truly represent Judaism, and that, in attacking them, we are meant to make a direct attack on Judaism? In Mt it does appear that the church is more clearly set over against Judaism in certain parts of the tradition eg "their synagogues" , occurring on only one occasion in Mk (1.39), a phrase Mt exploits extensively, thus emphasizing the church as a separate entity over against the synagogue. /25 Yet there remains the problem that, throughout the major and pre- Passion material, the crowds generally remain sympathetic to Jesus. In this Mt is true to his Marcan source upon which he largely depends. /26 When we come to Jerusalem, the city dominated by the Trial and Crucifixion, we find the church hostile and become the mouthpiece of the hostile authorities only at this point. Such a situation must qualify the claim that in addressing the leaders Mt is addressing the whole of Israel. It also modifies any claim that there is a thoroughgoing anti-Judaism [if the author is a Pharisee (So S. Schulz, S. van Tilborg,) he might well have brought his anti-semitism with him)] in Mt's Gospel. /27 The notorious cry "His blood be on us and on our children" (23.35) belongs to sections on Pilate and his wife that have been largely questioned as the construction of the final Passion story of the Gospel. It is sobering to reflect what such construction has caused over centuries of great suffering among the Jewish people by this Jewish act of self-cursing.

Now come now to the passage already mentioned which provides the fiercest denunciations in Mt - and without any attempt at

mitigation rather after the style of Amos ie Mt ch.23 The Pharisees are described as "hypocrites" (in ch.6 those described as "hypocrites" are not identified but the descriptions fit in with what is said in ch.23 of the Pharisees), oppressive and callous, vain and exhibitionist, children of hell, blind, foolish, hair-splitting legalists, extortionate and rapacious, iniquitous, serpents, broods of vipers, ruthless murderers. The list reads like a catena of sins, such as might be used to instruct new converts. Yet all the commandments are not broken eg there is no charge of idolatry, Sabbath-breaking ie there is a sense of historic reality. A number of charges are based on tradition eg hypocrisy (Mk 7.6), oppressive and callous (Lk 11.46) vain and exhibitionist (Mk 12.38,39); hair-splitting legalists, extortionists and rapacious; brood of vipers, ruthless murderers. Matthew, in expanding and organizing his sources, gives an added sternness to what is said eg "You blind guides, straining out a gnat and swallowing a camel" (Mt 23.24) on the matter of tithing.

It is possible to see the charges, in a number of instances, as the kind of thing we might expect. Legalism eg can be ruthless and callous; it can pretend to be what it is not - and not even be aware that it is pretence; it can be cunning and deceitful; it can be vain and exhibitionist; it may be more difficult to see it express itself as rapacious and extortionist - yet the charge of devouring widows' houses lies far back in the tradition. The charge of murder seems unlikely, as a general rule, Jesus' crucifixion being an extreme example. Paul of course, the Pharisee, is described as breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord. Stoning, as we know, was the legal sentence for certain infringements of the law. We can however understand such murder as that of a murderous spirit. Jesus as we know equated murder with anger or hate. Rigid orthodoxy is often not distinguished for its compassion and love.

The charges, it should be noted, are to be seen in the light of Mt's main purpose. He is setting forth Jesus as the Christ, the One who proclaims the nearness of the kingdom, the One who is to save his people from their sins - a crucial verse, not always fully considered in its relation to the whole Gospel.(1.21) It is Jesus who gives to his church the authority to bind and loose (16.19) and the

sion of the church on earth will express the decision of  
en: "I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven  
what you allow on earth will be allowed in heaven."  
s in relation to Jesus himself who takes on the features  
he exalted Lord that people find the way of wisdom or  
way of folly, the way of life or the way of destruction,  
way of forgiveness or the way of judgment. In other words  
can be argued that what we are seeing in this indictment  
he Pharisees is more a theological judgment in the light  
he church's understanding of Jesus than anything else.  
s the Pharisees who refuse to enter the kingdom. It is  
who forbid Jews to have anything to do with the kingdom  
ised by Jesus. The pronouncement of the woes on the  
isaic scribes begins significantly with the fact that  
have rejected Jesus: "Alas for you, lawyers and Pharisees  
cribes that you are! You shut the door of heaven in men's  
s; you do not enter yourselves, and when others are entering,  
stop them." (23.13) The mission of the church is one  
he dominant concerns of Matthew, and the Pharisees lack  
response, their strenuous efforts to resist the progress  
he Christian church, call forth this indictment of Jesus.  
ave no clear evidence that any Pharisees came to follow  
s in his lifetime. It is probable that in this highly  
uential people Jesus found his greatest obstacle.  
e can come at the problem from another direction. The  
stry of Jesus was concerned among other things with the  
lsion of demons. It is especially stressed by Mk who  
in it one aspect of the meaning of Christ's death -  
mph over evil spirits. Mt retained in a modified way  
interest of Mk. In Jesus the powers of the kingdom were  
loose on the powers of evil and triumphed. Every aspect  
he ministry of Jesus tends to be seen in the context of  
struggle of good and evil. Jesus stands over against  
evil powers who make use of people for their malign purposes.  
s possible to see here a "Verteufelung" of the  
sition. As the tradition develops, the opposition tends  
e stereotyped and qualifications within it obscured. The  
ys" that belong to the historical situation become obscured.  
Pharisees are, so to speak, "devilized".  
onfirmation of this way of interpreting the severe terms  
which the Pharisees are described can be paralleled by  
r phenomena which become clear in Mt's Gospel. Take eg

the portrait of Jesus. How human is the picture presented here? It must be confessed that what we find here is not primarily the portrait of an obscure Jew of uncertain orthodoxy with very human features. Such features are present but do not dominate the picture. Rather we are aware of the Lord of the Church who demands obedience: "Not everyone who says to me, 'Lord, Lord' will enter the kingdom of heaven but he who does the will of my Father in heaven" (7.2). Jesus proclaims the new law of the kingdom with the authority of a second Moses. In the regal "But I say unto you..", we are conscious of the exalted Lord addressing the church. The human aspects of Jesus recede and are taken over by the divine. Again, while Mk preserves harsher features of the disciples' witness and character, Mt sometimes softens such features. (It is possible, on the other hand, that Mk highlights the disciples' weaknesses to challenge the church to costly discipleship). We may give one example: where Mk in the account of Jesus' walking on the water stresses the disciples' lack of understanding, that they have forgotten the miracle of the loaves, that their hearts were hardened, Mt inserts a confession of wonder and worship: "They worshipped him, saying: 'Truly you are the Son of God'" (14.33) [Mt does not however always ignore the shabby aspects of the disciples' faith (cf 14.30-33; 16,8 and par; 16.23 and par). But if the portrait of the disciples does exhibit some inconsistencies, it is generally true that the portrait tends to be enhanced. The more remote the period of the disciples the greater the reverence shown. Contrariwise, the image of the hostile authorities becomes all the more sombre.

Another question that is sometimes overlooked is this: "How far was it intended that the Pharisees would read this Gospel?" Was this not an internal affair of the church, undergoing severe testing at the hands of the authorities? By placing the powerful authorities who are constantly hostile to Jesus and his followers on the opposition, it may be that Mt is encouraging the church to endure eg "He who endures to the end, will be saved" (Mt 24.13 and par.). In this connection we may refer to the so-called "Beatitudes" in Mt. At the start, they are given in the third person eg "Blessed are the poor in spirit.." (Mt 5.3-10). Then they change to the second person, after the beatitude: "Blessed are those who are persecuted for

teousness' sake, for to them belongs the kingdom of heaven." become words addressed directly to the church: "Blessed you when people revile you and persecute you and utter all kinds of evil against you falsely on my account." Have we a description here of what the Pharisaic authorities were doing to the church of Mt's day? We ask the question because it is mainly difficult to fit into the period of Jesus. If then the circumstances of the church are those of persecution, of defamation, outrage and misrepresentation and these from scribal experts, then the Gospel can be seen as a message of encouragement to stand fast. Similarly, in the indictment of the Pharisaic scribes, the situation of Mt's day helps to define and expand the polemic which in other circumstances might not have been constructed. If Mt keeps inserting the description "Pharisees" into his Gospel, such an action only makes sense if it has relevance for the people to whom he is speaking.

The Gospel was never meant to be an absolute judgment on Judaism of that time, though sadly the church may have taken it this way. Jesus in Mt never ceases to be the Jesus who insists on mercy, on forgiveness without limit, who sums up the essence of the whole law in the command to love, to love God and to love our fellows, who fulfils the purpose enshrined in his name - "to save his people from their sins" Mt does not charge the whole of Judaism for the crowds in Galilee were generally sympathetic to his ministry. They are those who listen to what he has to say and are depicted as forming an attentive and responsive audience. Rather Mt charges only a small, energetic and chasidic group within Judaism.

There is something else that is worth bearing in mind. The threats of the OT still remain for the Jewish-Christian community an ideal. Their writings often include severe indictments of the people of God which were intended to elicit a response in repentance. They proclaimed judgment and made no apology for it. Mt, more than any other Gospel, allows us to see the stern side of Jesus. While the main thrust is directed to the scribal experts, Jesus also addresses those who are guilty of lawlessness i.e. charismatic groups who appear to have claimed that moral demands did not matter. Such professed lawbreakers work "lawlessness" (7.23) The judgment to which they are liable is expressed in stern terms reminiscent of Old Testament e.g. "furnace of fire", "weeping and gnashing of teeth."

If Jesus like the prophets proclaims judgement, he also emphatically proclaims mercy whether it be to disciples or to Pharisees. Indeed it would be possible to substitute "disciples" for "Pharisees" throughout Mt. "Disciples" equally with the Pharisees are required to produce the fruits of righteous living. The emphasis throughout Mt is on practical, down to earth religion.

We have continually to ask the question as to why Mt wrote his Gospel. Mt wrote it to cater for catechetical and pastoral needs. He uses polemic as a safeguard for the faithful over against what would distort the way of Jesus and obscure the real Christ. If the Gospel has been misused or misrepresented in church history, this does not imply or suggest necessarily that it is anti-semitic.

### Notes

\* Lecture delivered at the Opening Public Meeting of Union Theological College, Belfast on 6th October 1986

1. Search Press, London
2. Writing on prejudice in John's Gospel, R. Leistner prefers the description "antijudaism" (Antijudaismus im Johannevangelium, Bern/Frankfurt 1974), claiming that the idea "antisemitism" was first coined in its contemporary sense by W. Marr in 1879, op.cit. N.24, 154
3. D. Hill, "Some recent trends in Matthaean Studies" (IBS, 1, 1979 141f) writes: "I find it difficult to say that he (Mt) has severed all links with emerging Judaism to the extent of denying that the Jews have any longer hope of being part of the true or new Israel of God."
4. Cf W.G. Kümmel, (Introduction to the NT 1973<sup>2</sup>, 115f) suggests that Mt's position is in no way particularistic and what he is saying is not that church is the "new" Israel but the "true" Israel
5. Cf. K. Stendahl, The School of St Matthew, Philadelphia 1968<sup>2</sup>, x where in the revised edition he still holds on to the "school" idea, not of Jesus, but of Mt.
6. B.H. Streeter's contention (The Four Gospels, London 1930, 150) is still a possibility; also D.Hill (The Gospel of Matthew London 1972, 50-52 ) for a discussion on the place of origin; also IBS op.cit 141
7. The catechetical motif hardly covers all the Mt material cf Kümmel op.cit 118; cf also G.D. Kilpatrick (Origins of the gospel

of St Matthew, Oxford 1946, 72-100) for the liturgical motif and evaluation by D. Guthrie (New Testament Introduction, London 1963) ad loc. For the tradition of eg W. Barclay, The First Three Gospels, London 1966, 19

This is almost inevitable in a NT scholarship dominated by R. Bultmann (The History of the Synoptic Tradition, ET London 1963) who declares (147) that in Ch 23. 16-19, 23f, and 25f inter alia that "this is the first time that we have any right to talk of sayings of Jesus".

For the Beatitudes see Hans-Theo Wrege (Die Überlieferungsgeschichte der Bergpredigt, Tübingen 1968); for the Lord's Prayer cf J. Jeremias, [NT Theology (ET) 1971, 193ff ]

Conflict belongs to each part of the tradition, Q, Mark and special sources.

Official standards of orthopraxis were in ancient Judaism laid down by the religious party (or parties) in power; this in Jesus' time was made up predominantly by the Pharisaic party. (Cf M. Black, The Scrolls and Christian origins, London 1960, 6)

M.D. Johnson (The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies, Cambridge 1969) claims that the genealogy in Mt represents a defence of the Davidic Messianic line over against the Levitical (177)

The common view that Mt softens the portrait of the disciples in Mk has notable exceptions (cf Kümmel, op.cit. 108)

cf for the Q source (3.7 and par) and for Mk (9.34; 12.24 and par)

The three occasions are 7.36; 11.37; 14.1; it is not necessary to see hostility behind the invitations.

On Joseph cf Howard C. Kee, IDE ad loc.

If the identification of "some of them" as "scribes" and the term "Pharisees" is secondary, then Lk's phrase could be original even if tis ex is characteristic of his style; cf. I. Howard Marshall, (The Gospel of Lk Exeter 1978, 472) for the last point.

Some scholars despair, however, of finding a sitz im leben for Mt's Gospel eg W. Trilling (Das Wahre Israel, Munich 1964, 220): "So scheint sich auch hier zu ergeben, dass eine allseits befriedigende Antwort auf die Frage nach der 'Sitz im Leben' bis heute nicht gefunden ist"

Dr Mary Smallwood (The Jews under Roman Rule, Leiden 1976) points out the remarkable impact of Jewish proselytism in the Roman Empire and notably in Rome itself. It may have occurred as early as the second century BC (205) and been the reason for the expulsion of the Jews in 139 AD. In spite of edicts from various Emperors forbidding proselytism, converts continued (472, 541)

on this point there is no difficulty in bringing Acts (8.3; 9.1) and Paul Phil 3.6) together .

22. Cf Kümmel, op.cit. 117
23. Refs to phrase are found in Mt 3.7; 16.1, 6, 11, 12; cf. also Acts 23.7
24. P. Bonnard (L'Evangile selon Saint Matthieu, Paris 1965<sup>2</sup>) points the difficulty of attributing the phrase to Mt's time if after the fall of Jerusalem when the Sadducees disappeared. It is possible belongs to early tradition but a tradition which tended to bring together the various authorities as those associated with the trial and death of Jesus.
25. The phrase only occurs one one occasion in Lk and apparently in dependence on Mk.; Mt however has the phrase at 4.23; 9.35; 10.17; 13.54; cf. "your synagogues" (23.34) This would suggest the church is separated from Judaism but it could be a phrase brought back from a later stage into the tradition. It is not found in the FG which only has the singular (6.59; 18.20)
26. The exceptions to this friendliness are Jesus' own family (3.21; cf 3.31 Mk) and his own home town (Mk 6.1-6). Even at the Cleansing of the Temple, there is no mention of crowd hostility (Mk 11.15-19) finally it is only at the Trial we are told that the chief priests stir up the crowd to ask for Barabbas and after this we find the crowd hostile. The picture is much the same in Mt; any conflict there is, is with the authorities
27. On this whole question see W.G. Kümmel, Introd., 114f who does not find the argument for Gentile Christian authorship convincing
28. Cf J. Fitzmyer, "Antisemitism and Mt 27.25" TS XXVI:669, 1965; also D.E. Garland, The Intention of the Woes of Mt 23, Leiden 1979, 81, 159
29. So W.G. Kümmel, "Die Weherufe über die Schriftlehrten u. Pharisäer (Mt 23.13-36)" in Antijudaismus im NT (ed. W. Eckert, N.P. Levinson and M. Stöhr) Munich 1967, 146 ; cf also S. Legasse, "L 'antijudaïsme dans l'Evangile selon Mt", in L'Evangile selon Matthieu (ed M. Didier) Gembloux 1971, 417

Reviews, IBS 8, October, 1986.  
Bruce Chilton, A Galilean Rabbi and his Bible:  
Jesus' own interpretation of Isaiah.

London: SPCK, 1984.

pp.216 £15.

This is a slippery sort of book, one it is rather difficult to categorize. Its title - surely one of the more eye-catching of recent years - might lead one who is acquainted with Chilton's recent work on the Targum of Isaiah to expect a popular presentation of some aspects of that work. (Already in his book God in Strength: Jesus' announcement of the kingdom (1979) he argued that Jesus' preaching reflects the Targumic understanding of the kingdom of God.) But it is not so simple as that. The question of what precise audience the book is addressed to is one which I found recurring as I read.

At the outset it appears that the author is addressing those inhabitants of the academic ghetto of New Testament study who treat the New Testament as if it were "in a world of its own, and not the product of an age and a people that we can understand fully only by looking at documents other than the New Testament". The purpose of the book, it is explained in the preface, is twofold. "The first is to present historical evidence and evaluation which help us to understand Jesus and his followers." Secondly, an examination of Jesus' style of preaching and the way in which he used the Bible of his day, allows the author an opportunity to develop a view of how the Bible can be read critically and at the same time in the context of faith.

The book, like Caesar's Gaul, is divided into three parts (or, to borrow the words of a not so famous Irish orientalist from the past, "quartered into three halves"), the first two of which are devoted to the first of the above-mentioned purposes. Part One (entitled "Introduction", and sub-divided into 1. Jesus and Judaism, and 2. Targum research and early Judaism),

offers "a general orientation in the field to those who are not familiar with the study of rabbinic literature". Several criticisms could be levelled at this section, though it is doubtful whether the reader will be seriously misled. It is in the opening section of Part Two, however, where one encounters explanations of the terms "Synopsis" and "Synoptic" that one wonders about the book's intended audience. Surely, none of the denizens of that afore-mentioned ghetto, even if they are unacquainted with the current state of research in the Targums, or with the conventions employed in the citation of rabbinic literature, can be so ignorant of New Testament studies as to require such explanations as these.

Quite apart from this perhaps trivial detail it is in Part Two: Jesus and the Targum to Isaiah that the book is at its most slippery. Although there are a couple of striking coincidences in wording between citations of Isaiah attributed to Jesus in the Gospels and translations in the Targum, Chilton assigns even the earliest strata of the Targum to a post-70 date, and although he speaks in some places of Jesus' having used the Targum, in other places he reminds us that this cannot have been possible. It may be legitimate either to use the New Testament to reconstruct the pre-history of the Targum or to use the Targum to illuminate the New Testament, but to attempt to do both simultaneously, as I suspect Chilton may be doing, is illogical.

In Part Three: Jesus' style of preaching scripture as fulfilled, I have some difficulty in following Chilton's thoughts. Perhaps this is because I am not a theologian. Yet, as I reach the end of the book, a glimmer of understanding dawns. Perhaps what he calls the "critical", "experiential" style of preaching is what I have in my simplicity hitherto been accustomed to describe as "preaching out of context" - a procedure which I have long felt to have been unfairly disparaged. I must read the book again.

Gottwald: The Hebrew Bible, A Socio-Literary Introduction, Fortress Press 1985. pp.XXX, 702, including numerous maps, tables and charts.

Gottwald's previous major publication, The Tribes of Yahweh, was praised by one reviewer as holding promise of being "a point of reference parallel in significance, potential and authority to Harnack's Prolegomena and Albright's From the Stone Age to Christianity". The basis for this judgment was that the book was not taken "simply as another critical analysis, but as a reorganisation of the data around quite new categories". This evaluation of that work was by no means too extravagant, and a comparison of the book here reviewed with other comparable works published in the last few years will suggest that this Introduction should be judged in a similar way. All the familiar items of information are here, but the organisation and presentation of them, and the general context within which this information is now set, are refreshingly new.

An Old Testament introduction normally concentrates exclusively on the development of the Old Testament text from its smallest literary units to its final form in the Masoretic text and the various versions: so, in short, the task of introduction has come to comprise "the treatment of the literary problems, of genres (or types) of literature, of the composition and formation of the individual books, and of the transmission of the text and origin of the canon". It is this traditional approach which is not set in the comprehensive context of the socio-historical study of ancient Israel and recent literary study of the Old Testament. These last two topics are not simply attached in the form of an appendix, but are integrated throughout the course of the complete study.

After having surveyed in Part I the present plurality of approaches to the Old Testament, the geography and archaeology of the land, and the development of the canon, text and versions, Gottwald turns in Parts II and III to the socio-literary study of the text. Part II treats the pre-monarchic traditions and those of Joshua and Judges as the traditions of the revolutionary pre-monarchic tribal confederacy; Part III examines the Deuteronomistic history, especially Samuel and Kings, together with the pre-exilic prophets, in the context of monarchic Israel, understood as a counter-revolutionary establishment; and Part IV turns to the later prophets and writings within the framework of "Home Rule under Great Britain: Israel's Colonial Recovery". Regularly, at all appropriate points, the findings are graphically presented in charts and tables, and the book concludes with comprehensive bibliographies of English language material for each section.

This book admirably combines the usefulness of a textbook with the freshness of originality, its originality being apparent particularly in the bringing together into an overall synthesis of a variety of fields of specialisation. There are few Old Testament scholars in a position to present with such clarity a survey of scholarship over the range which is covered here. This will surely be a standard work of reference for many years.

The methodological foundations for the book were laid, in very large measure, in The Tribes of Yahweh, particularly with regard to the criticism of the Pentateuch and Joshua-Judges, and also to the historical-materialist approach to history and ancient texts. On both of these points Gottwald is certainly still open to question. The Pentateuchal criticism of Martin Noth, which is reproduced here, has been fundamentally weakened by the work of Rendtorff, Schmidt, Rose and others, so that the whole idea of continuous Pentateuchal sources, going back to a common pre-monarchic basis, the national epic of tribal Israel, must now be regarded as quite uncertain. Noth's Pentateuchal criticism is necessary, however, for the very neat historical-materialist presentation of Gottwald, which requires a correlation of social conditions with theological ideas, so that the latter can be seen as generated by the former (as in Chart 12); so it is clear that any radical change in Pentateuchal criticism is bound to have far-reaching effects on fundamental aspects of Gottwald's enterprise. It must, therefore, be taken as a potentially damaging aspect of his book that its magnificent synthesis integrates up-to-date sociological and literary study with very probably quite dated Pentateuchal criticism.

Trinity College  
Dutlin,2

A.D.H. Mayes.

Paul Davis: God and the New Physics. Penguin. 1984 (originally published by J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd. 1983). pp.229, plus preface, references, bibliography and index.

The author is Professor of Theoretical Physics at the University of Newcastle upon Tyne. In the preface Professor Davies states his objectives in four questions: Why are the laws of nature what they are? Why does the universe consist of the things it does? How did these things arise? How did the universe achieve its organisation? The author treats all of these affairs in a philosophical manner and concludes: "we have searched across the range of modern physics...in our search for God. Much of what has been presented will no doubt confirm the opinion of some that science is implacably opposed to religion...It would be foolish to deny that many of the traditional religious ideas about God, man, and the nature of the universe have been swept away by the new physics. But our search has turned up many positive signs, too."

Here is a physicist writing about philosophical questions - not in order to deny traditional religious beliefs, nor in order to present a materialist view of the universe; but writing in order to find truth, and because physics can no longer limit itself to the laws of nature nor astronomy to the galaxies. Both sciences are asking the meaning of the traditional terms of times, space, origination, infinity, in the light of new knowledge. "Does modern astronomy inevitably expose the limits of the physical universe and compel us to invoke the supernatural?" (p.25)

This is not an easy book to digest in detail; e.g. "it is thus possible to conceive of an infinitely long fence enclosing a finite area of field. Various kinds of infinity are illustrated by mathematics in ch.2, and then in ch.3 this variety is related to questions of space and time, o

and effect, and thereby to God. The average reader can digest, intellectually, atoms, and possibly protons and neutrons and electrons; what about the quantum theory and quarks, gluons and muons, leptons and neutrinos.... a singularity, and figures of the order of ten followed by a million zeros? Nevertheless, as with the biblical promise about coming to the end, so the readers who persevere through the technicalities of physics, is rewarded. After dealing with the fundamental structure of matter, with black holes and cosmic chaos, Professor Davies concludes: "It is hard to resist the impression that the present structure of the universe, apparently so sensitive to minor alterations in the values (i.e., the fundamental constants of nature) has been rather carefully thought out. Such a conclusion can, of course, only be subjective. In the end it boils down to a question of belief.... but...the seemingly miraculous concurrence of numerical values that nature has assigned to the fundamental constants must remain the most compelling evidence for the existence of cosmic design." (p.189)

This book is full of surprises. For example, the quantum theory introduces an indeterministic element into the world, and this makes room for free will, which seemed to be denied by the mechanistic view of earlier science. But the indeterministic element causes further trouble in relation to the freedom of both God and man (ch.10). Another surprise concerns the physicist's view of the world, arising from the quantum theory. This posits the interaction of observer and observed event in the world of physics. The reductionism of physics must be completed by a holistic approach which leads from the fundamental laws of nature to concepts such as heat, life, waves, cells, man, history, evil, beauty and

"These cannot be explained away as 'nothing but' atoms or quarks..."

5) Another surprise concerns the author's treatment of miracles. Miracles are ruled out, almost, - not on the grounds of incompatibility with the laws of physics, but - on the grounds of lack of evidence and that if such evidence be available it does not prove the existence of a divine creator God.

Despite its technical language and concepts, the student of religion will find a reading of this book a worthwhile preparation for understanding the subject of creation. To the Christian preacher who must, like the Christian lay person who should, try to understand the opening proclamation of the Apostles' Creed, this book is recommended. This reviewer agrees heartily with the author that "the new physics has overruled so many commonsense notions of space, time and matter that no serious religious thinker can ignore it." (p.229) The physicist-author who says God does not find Him through physics; equally he finds that physics does not rule out God. Indeed, it offers "positive signs" in this direction. "God and the New Physics" show that theology can co-exist with science; it may be that the latter even needs the former.

Mill College,  
St.

J.T. MacCormack.

Kilpatrick says that he is frequently asked, "Aren't psychology and religion just two different ways of getting at the same thing?" He is quite sure that the answer should be an emphatic "No", but recognises that many Christians have allowed their beliefs to become entangled with ideas of self-esteem, and self-fulfilment, about which popular psychology seems to have a lot to say. The entanglement is the more regrettable because these ideas are foreign to Christianity.

For non-Christians popular psychology is equally seductive. Many turn to it as a substitute for traditional faith. They may even think of it as a more evolved form of religion; a more efficient and compassionate way of doing good. "Psychology levels the hills of anxiety and makes the crooked way straight. It is the rod and staff that comfort them."

Readers are reminded that an overserious attitude towards the self is an unhealthy and ultimately defeating pre-occupation. Even in purely worldly terms there is no certainty that psychological ideas bring about any improvement in our condition.

I doubt whether there is a page in the book which is not hard hitting and at the same time, amusing to all except the purveyors of popular psychology. Among these Kilpatrick includes those 'media evangelists' who "preach a gospel of personal mastery and success that has very little to do with Scripture and a great deal to do with positive thinking....At the back of this is the idea that faith will lead to healthy personality, a cure for disease, and even to financial security. In these cases it is sometimes not at all clear whether we are to believe in God or in ourselves."

The book is so readable that it can easily be read through in one session but because it is divided into short chapters (on average 14 pages each) which are self contained, it can be put down and picked up again without feeling that one has lost the thread.

Any misunderstanding about the contents of the book which may have been aroused by the title and the picture on the cover of a glowing translucent globe resembling an apple offered up in hands like those of Eve (or may Jezebel since the finger nails are painted) should be corrected by the sub-title 'The Fallure of Modern Psychology'.

We may wish that the distinction between the legitimate and the illegitimate roles of psychology in society, to which Kilpatrick refers in the preface had been developed in the body of the book. But as this would certainly have made the book longer, increased its price and, perhaps, dulled its cutting edge, we may be grateful for what we have. This is an assertion of the irreplaceable values of the Christian faith by one who is familiar with its most seductive substitute.

As is stated on the back cover by Paul C. Vitz, Associate Professor in the Department of Psychology, New York University, this book is a major contribution to the recently emerging Christian critique of psychology.

Vincent Parkin.

EREOSCOPE" - an instrument in which each of two pictures is examined a separate lens, and the two images are inclined so as to shift the images towards one another, and thus to ensure or to facilitate the joining of the two images into one, standing out in relief with solidarity." So says my dictionary. This was the figure of speech used with striking effect by Frances E. Willard, a leading exponent of women's rights and a social reformer, typical of many outstanding women in North America in the second half of last century. In a book published in 1889 Frances Willard wrote: "We need commentators to bring out the women's side of the book; we need the stereoscopic view of truth in general, which can only be had when woman's eye and man's together shall discern the perspective of the Bible's full-orbed revelation. I do not at all impugn the good intention of the good men who have been our exegetes, and bow humbly in presence of their scholarship; but, while they turn their scientific telescopes on truth, I may be allowed to make a correction for "personal equation" in the results which they espy."

Two books have been put in my hands for review and each is a worthy contribution to furthering M/s Willard's "correction for the personal equation." The first is

F.J. Maloney: First Among the Faithful. Darton, Longman & Todd. 1985. 124pp. £3.50.

The author is a distinguished member of the Salesian Order whose founder, Don Bosco, based his philosophy on "reason, kindness and Christian faith." At a time when "the voices of women are being heard in the Christian churches" Dr. Maloney joins, as a male theologian, in offering a careful study of the New Testament use of the "woman factor" in formulating its teaching and presenting theological bases for our understanding of Gospel, Church and humanity. This is not a mere addition to the long series on "women" around the Master, or as they appear in the writings of the first century. Rather it attempts to demonstrate that the writers, as well as the Lord, found in childbirth, relationship, motherhood and other female experiences ways of illuminating the story, as well as shaping the circumstances, of which it tells, in such varied forms by so many hands over such a long period.

Dr. Maloney stresses that, while seeking to further the women's movement, male theologians have made a valiant and demanding contribution. Like him he does not want his writing to be "of the heart", as if critical hard-nosed scholarship might be toned down. His research is "of the head" and so, in the best sense of that term.

Any reader seeking the relevant texts for such a study will find them plentiful, fully documented. The format makes for easy reading. First we have a survey of the Lord's relationship with women - in the miracles he performed, in the parables he taught, in occasions of conflict, in the interesting incidents at Bethany and at the Cross and the empty tomb. The author finds a freshness and novelty in the place of women in our Lord's attitude and treatment. "What is it in Jesus that creates such a revolutionary newness?" Maloney traces this to the conviction that in Jesus was found the "inauguration of the new world where God is allowed to be God and "where men and women are allowed to be men and women, - brothers and sisters equally."

Adela Yarbro Collins (Editor): *Feminist Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship* (Scholars Press 1985  
144 pages. Unpriced)

is my second book for review. This is one of a series of ten volumes to celebrate the centennial of the Society of Biblical Literature in US 1980. When the anniversary came along it was found that not one woman was on the centennial committee and so M/s Collins was added. She has arranged with seven other theologically highly qualified women in her country to take up a variety of aspects of her subject. She herself is professor in New Testament at McCormick Seminary and several others hold professorial positions. The professor of Theology at Notre Dame University, Elizabeth Schussler Fiorenza, in what may be regarded as the cardinal chapter, considers ways of "remembering the past". She lays at the door of Leopold Ranke, famous 19th century Prussian historian, the blame for leading historical research along a line which assumed that the goal of scientific, value-neutral, objectivity could be reached. The standpoint and presuppositions of the historian need not affect the data to be uncovered and established, so long as the method was sustained objectively. Over against this may be put W.J. Mommsen's stress on the social conditioning of all historical judgements, or the dictum of Bultmann: "No understanding is possible without pre-understanding." No historian is value-free or neutral, the best one may aim for is understanding and uncovering and declaring of interests! This all adds up to the right to claim for "the feminist perspective" a standpoint which can correct the male dominated and rocentric, traditional interpretations. "The truly historical understanding of historical inquiry...invites active feminist participation in the writing of human history in order to keep 'open' our unfilled historical possibilities for a more human future."

It is important to emphasize, as these writers do, that female scholars are seriously committed to holding together historical criticism and feminist studies. Bernadette Brooken, in her contribution, likens the search for the realities enshrined in the New Testament to pre-history rather than history when it comes to trying to find the female qualities and relationships, since these had been worked over by male writers and interpreted orally in male settings." A history of Christian women in the first century would be a history of women, and not a history of male attitudes towards women." However, when accomplished, such a history would afford not only a new view of women but also of men - there must be a complementarity giving full place to the distinctiveness of each sex.

Drorah Setel gives a Jewish insight into the necessary corrective of the personal, relational and connectedness (woman's concerns) for the male emphasis on dualistic, subject/object assumptions. Another Jewish writer, Ester Fuchs, has a short but fascinating piece on the deceptive nature of so many Old Testament women as portrayed by male writers, and placed at points of religious, social or political tension. "Celebrated or denigrated, the characters of deceptive women, which constitute the majority of female characters in the Bible, serve as an effective ideological tool that perpetuates the suspicion and distrust of women, and that validates women's subordination through discriminatory literary technique. By uncovering this hidden fact we may be in a better position to understand and re-evaluate what appears to be one of the most ambiguous characters of women in the Hebrew Bible."

Paul's thought on woman is tackled we are quickly taken beyond acknowledged negative texts regarding female submission and enforced obedience, to the new status of woman in the church through her being "Christ". In his letters, the earliest interpretation of the teaching of our Lord, Paul shows that what he has to tell us is quite in line with the attitude of the Master to women. Then, in Matthew's Gospel, we are shown, for example through the genealogical table, in which women have their significant place, despite irregularities of marital relationships, that women as well as men are in the line from which Jesus was born. Both men and women may be open to God as disciples, and what it may to hold that position.

The New Testament is a well recognised source of teaching of the importance of women to Jesus and his band from the birth stories to the Cross. In the New Testament's treatment we are shown how "all the legal and cultural conditioning that surrounds womanhood must be eliminated, as she is just as important as a man in being the hearer of the word, a companion of Jesus, and on his way and the recipient of his powerful, forgiving and curing presence." Women are both chronologically and qualitatively "first" in the New Testament order of faith, Luke is found to teach.

This last point is further developed in John's Gospel. Maloney finds a pattern on three moments of the progress of John's story: (i) The Samaritan woman; (ii) Mary and Martha at Bethany; (iii) Mary Magdalene. We find, at each of those points, women used as the vehicle to show the possibility of the journey of faith. Jesus addressed his mother as "Woman" at the beginning in Cana and from the Cross. Woman is first in coming to faith-relationship with Jesus, furthermore she is to be followed as pioneer and leader on the faith-journey.

The use, in the Gospel, of childbirth and its pains leading to joy and new life, is further developed in the Apocalypse. The latter, coming from a time of persecution for the faith, shows how a peculiarly feminine experience is used to reveal the truth of suffering being borne in hope of new life and life. Woman's patience bears fruit, so must there be, for any Christian people, faithfulness with love.

In the Revelation we meet the figure of woman "clothed with the sun" and the dragon devouring the child" and the "woman in the desert...nourished for a thousand two hundred and sixty days." Maloney treats this as representing in her person the whole of humanity in all its ambiguity of wretchedness and glory- at risk in face of evil powers, yet never overcome by the power of God. She still remains worthy of being "the bride of the Lamb of God." What was lost through Eve and her offspring may be restored through Woman in the new family life in Christ. Dr. Maloney may rightly claim that he has begun, in such a study, to help in the release of woman from the taboos and myths that have surrounded her in Bible and Church traditions; woman is found to be "first in faith", leading and bearing the message of the incarnate and exalted Lord ahead of the other apostles.

There could be no better way of bringing out the startling novelty of the re-evaluation of woman made possible through the New Testament story than to quote (as Maloney does) a section of the Gnostic Gospel of Thomas: Simon Peter said to them (the risen Jesus and his disciples): "Let Mary go out from among us, because women are not worthy of the word of life." Jesus said: See I shall lead her, so that I will make her male, that she too may become a living spirit, resembling you males. For every woman who makes herself male will enter the Kingdom of heaven". (Logion 114)

That last sentence indicates the tenour of the whole book. Scholarship, however "exact", when male dominated and exclusive of female perspective is unlikely to proceed in future as in the past centuries. Men and women together, with "stereoscopic" complementarity, must combine in this field of theological research and teaching as in all other areas where personal and social factors are at all involved.

A swift look through the list of contributors to the dictionaries, commentaries, editorial boards and other "authorities" will soon show the quite deplorable absence of the feminine perspective. All the more must we welcome in books like those reviewed the clear beginnings of such correction of the equation.

Union Theological College  
Belfast

J.R. Boyd.

J. Lee Magnus, Sense and Absence

Semeia Studies, Scholars Press 1986  
Cloth \$14.95 pb \$10.95 pp136

The book deals at depth with the problem of the Marcan ending at 16 and argues that it is the ending Mk intended and that "fulfilment comes through silence, by means of an absence, a suspended ending." (24) The writer then illustrates these suspended endings from ancient history eg Aristotle, Demetrius, Homer, Euripides, Xenophon; then from the OT eg the story of Jephthah (Judges 29.11-40) or Jacob (Gen 29. 1-30) or Jonah and, finally, the NT. The arguments for suspended endings are not always convincing, and perhaps a little too eager. The author devotes chapter to "Structure and Silence in Mk" (87-105) where he seeks to trace the relationship of the overall structure and smaller structures of Mk to its ending (87) - a suggestive chapter.

The final chapter is particularly valuable for its arguments in support of Mk 16.8 being the original ending. He argues that the "process of foreshadowing and foreshadowing climactic events which are assumed but which never surface in the text is nothing more than what the readers have sensed all along." (109) Such foreshadowings include the resurrection which is everywhere presupposed in Mk [cf the so-called Passion predictions (8.31;9.31;10.33)], the predictions in Mk 13 and the Transfiguration (14.19). Thus Magnus can claim that Mk 16.1-8 gives a satisfactory closure, a closure paralleled in ancient literary writings. He quotes with approval Austen Farrer that the closing verses are "a strong complex refrain, answering all the ends of previous sections in the Gospel to which we might expect it to answer." The ending does not deny but affirms the resurrection of Jesus even if there is no description of the event itself. Finally it assumes the obedience of the women and the other disciples to the instructions of the angel. Thus such an absence of reference to the resurrection becomes the most permanent form of presence (122). The discussion is clear, the argument attractive and, generally, convincing.

Union Theological College  
Belfast

E.A. Russell

ger Beckwith

The Old Testament Canon of  
the New Testament Church  
and its Background in Early  
Judaism. SPCK, London,  
1985, pp.xiii-528, £35.00.

ger Beckwith has long since been noted for a series of exceedingly learned articles on such seemingly remote topics as, for example, 'The Significance of the Calendar for Interpreting Essene Chronology and Eschatology', 'Daniel 9 and the Date of Messiah's Coming in Essene, Hellenistic, Pharisaic, Zealot and Early Christian Computation' or 'The Pre-History and the Relationships of the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes: a Tentative Reconstruction'. Valuable as these essays have been as exercises in pure scholarship, they have now led to the production of a magnum opus which, while no less a work massive, painstaking scholarship, presents results which carry far-reaching practical implications.

For almost a century the standard critical view of the Old Testament Canon has been that propounded by H. E. Ryle (The Canon of the Old Testament, 1982, 2nd ed. 1909). Ryle's theory maintains that the canonization of the Old Testament took place in three stages:

- 1) The Pentateuch, recognised as canonical in the fifth century BC;
- 2) The Prophets, recognised as canonical in the third century BC, too soon for the inclusion of late historical and oracular books like Chronicles and Daniel;
- 3) The Hagiographa, containing most of the books disputed by the rabbis; and not formally recognised as canonical until the synod of Jamnia, about AD90.

Beckwith argues that Ryle's theory is fundamentally mistaken. He contends

that the three sections of the canon were closed not in three different eras, but at two: at the end of the last era the Law was finally recognised as canonical in

its entirety (parts of it had been regarded as canonical right from their first promulgation) and its canon closed. Then at some subsequent time all the remaining books which had come to be recognised as canonical were divided into two separate groups and the canon of each was regarded as closed (p.164-5).

(2) that in all likelihood it was Judas Maccabaeus and his associates who divided the non-Mosaic Scriptures into the two groups, the Prophets and the Hagiographa (p.165).

(3) that all three divisions of the Old Testament contain historical books, deliberately arranged so that

(a) in the Pentateuch, they take us from the creation to the death of Moses;

(b) in the Prophets, they cover the period from the entry into the Promised Land to the beginning of the Exile;

(c) in the Hagiographa, Daniel, Esther and Ezra-Nehemiah relate events during the Exile and at the time of the return, while Chronicles is placed last as a recapitulation of the whole biblical story (pp.158-9).

(4) that in addition to historical books (or material) each division contains another major type of literature thus

(a) Pentateuch : history plus law-books;

(b) Prophets : history plus oracular, visionary books by named prophets;

(c) Hagiographa : history plus lyrical and proverbial, sapiential books (p.157).

(5) that the earliest distribution of the books between the three divisions of the Old Testament, which probably originated in the list drawn up by Judas Maccabaeus, was that of the baraita on the order of the Prophets and Hagiographa in Bab. Baba Bathra 14b (=The Law: Gen., Ex. Lev., Nu., Dt.; The Prophets: Jos., Jud., Sam., Ki., Jer., Ezr. Is., The Twelve Prophets; The Hagiographa: Ruth, Ps., Job Prov., Eccl., Song of Songs, Lam., Dan., Est., Ezr.-Neh. Chron.) pp.153,157.

that the order of books in the third division (as in others) is determined by a logical plan, which puts Daniel with the historical books - more than half its chapters relate history; puts Daniel at the head of its group of historical books because its material covers the earliest part of the historical period on which the third division concentrates; and puts Chronicles at the end of the group because, as noted above, it recapitulates virtually the whole of Old Testament history from Adam onwards (pp.158-164).

From all this it follows (1) that the canon of the Old Testament was finally closed not less than 250 years earlier than AD90, the date proposed by Ryle's theory; (2) that books like Daniel and Chronicles were included in the third division of the canon not because they were written too late to be included in the second division before it was closed, but for altogether different reasons. If Beckwith is right, Ryle's theory, and what has been built on it, must be discarded.

Only so. If it is true, as many have argued, that Alexandrian Jewry had a different canon from Palestinian Jewry, that the Qumran community had a different canon in, and that the final decision on the extent of the canon was not made even by the Jews themselves until about sixty years after the crucifixion, then one could claim the authority of Jesus or his apostles for the canon (minus the Apocrypha) which Judaism eventually adopted. But if, as Beckwith maintains, the canon had long been closed by the time of Jesus and he accepted that canon as Scripture, then his attitude decides the question of the extent of the Old Testament canon for all those who accept his authority. The fact that even many Church Fathers, under the influence of that strange mixture of Greek translations and original compositions popularly known as the Septuagint, held a different view of the canon than Christ did, cannot be held (by Christians) to confer canonical status on books which were not in the canon which Christ himself regarded as already closed in his day. As an "Anglican of Protestant sympathies, engaged (as a representative of the Church) in discussion with the Eastern Orthodox"

(p.6), Beckwith is naturally aware of the implications of his findings for a question that has vexed Christendom ever since Jerome and Augustine disagreed so forcefully over the head of it. It is Mr. Beckwith's hope that his findings will at least help to open a way through the present ecumenical (and inter-faith) impasse on the subject (pp.9,437).

In addition his findings carry important implications for the dating of the composition of Daniel. The majority view is that Daniel was composed in Maccabean times. But if the canon was finally closed in the time of Judas Maccabaeus and Daniel was included in that canon, it is difficult to think that it had not already by that time been generally regarded as canonical. Moreover Beckwith points out that internal evidence (e.g. the type of calendar used, which for the various sects in Judaism was so important) shows that Daniel was not a product of the Essenes, and yet they accepted Daniel as canonical and made great use of it. Now the Essenes "seem to have dated their own definite emergence as a party between 171 and 167 BC....and any apocalypse produced from then on, if it had not come from the Essenes, would have come from their rivals, and would therefore not have secured Essene acceptance" (p.415). The conclusion is therefore that Daniel must have been regarded by Judaism in general as canonical and accepted as such by the Essenes before their emergence as a separate sect. If Beckwith is right, here is one more piece of evidence to emerge in recent years, indicating that the Maccabean dating of Daniel is no longer tenable (pp.355-8 and notes 66-84 pp.414-417).

Beckwith, of course, is not the first in recent times, as he himself points out, to undermine the bases on which Ryle's theory of the canon was built. In 1968 J. D. Purvis argued from the Qumran evidence that the Samaritans did not finally break with the Jews until the late second century BC. They must therefore have known a canon which already included the Prophets, and their reason for rejecting the Prophets and retaining only the Pentateuch was not, as Ryle argued, that at the time of their break with Judaism the canon only contained the

Pentateuch. A. C. Sundberg in 1964 showed that the idea that there existed a wider Alexandrian canon recognised as such by the Jews is unsubstantiated by the evidence. J. P. Lewis in 1964 questioned whether the so-called Synod of Jamnia was really a synod at all rather than a mere academic discussion: its influence on later rabbinical discussion was certainly limited. And in 1976 S. Z. Leiman already argued that the canon of the Hagiographa was closed not in the late first century AD but in the mid-second century BC.

Now comes Beckwith and argues that the closing of the canon was even earlier. His conclusions are reached not so much by adducing new evidence unavailable to earlier scholars (though there is some of that) but by a much more extensive use of evidence long since available but hitherto neglected, and a much more rigorous analysis of the evidence that has commonly been cited. His exposure of previous fallacies and the exposition of his own methodology (pp.7ff.) are impressive. His grasp of all the relevant ancient literature is phenomenal, and his analysis of it magisterial. His lucid argumentation therefore is powerfully persuasive..

Are his conclusions correct, then? Agreeable as Mr. Beckwith's findings are to the present reviewer's prejudices, it would be impertinent for a review of this size to attempt to analyse the enormously detailed and complex case which he has presented, let alone pronounce a final verdict. But certain it is that this mighty book has raised the discussion of the canon of the Old Testament to new heights of scholarship and sophistication.

Finally, when Mr. Beckwith calls for a new investigation of the dating of Daniel, "reviewing all the older evidence, and adding to it all the newer evidence which, especially since the Qumran discoveries, has been accumulating remarkably", the present reviewer finds it difficult to suppress the hope that Mr. Beckwith himself will answer his own call.

D. W. GOODING (Belfast).

Books received

- Dale C. Allison Jr, The end of the ages has come, Fortress 1985
- Joyce C. Baldwin, Esther, IVPress 1984
- Walter Brueggemann, David's truth In Israel's Imagination & Memory  
Fortress 1985
- Raymond E. Brown, Biblical Exegesis & Church Doctrine, Chapman 1985
- Raymond E. Brown, The churches The Apostles left behind, Chapman 1984
- C.K. Barrett, Church, Ministry & Sacraments in the NT, Paternoster 1985
- For Cameron, Sayings Traditions in the Apocryphon of James, Fortress 1985
- Maurice Casey, Son of Man; The Interpretation & Influence of Daniel 7  
SPCK 1949
- Bruce Chilton, Beginning NT Study, SPCK 1986
- David Cook, Thinking about Faith, A beginner's guide, IVPress 1986
- C.E.B. Cranfield, Romans, A shorter commentary, T&T Clark 1985
- J.D. Crossan, Four Other Gospels, Shadows on the Contours of Canon,  
Winston 1985
- Robert S. Eccles, E.R. Goodenough, A Personal Pilgrimage, SBL 1985
- Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Scripture & Christology, A statement of the Biblical  
Commission with commentary, Chapman 1986
- Robert W. Funk (Ed), New Gospel Parallels, Vol 1 and 2, Fortress 1985
- J.D. Crossan, Sayings Parallels, A Workbook for the Jesus Tradition  
Fortress 1986
- Harry Y. Gamble, The New Testament Canon, Its Making & Meaning, Fortres  
1985
- F.E. Greenspan, E. Hilgert & B.L. Mack (Eds), Nourished with Peace,  
Studies in Hell. Judaism in memory of S. Sandmel  
Scholars Press 1984
- D.W. Hardy & D., F. Ford, Jubilate, Theology in Praise, Darton, Longman  
& Todd, 1984
- Edward C. Hobbs, Bultmann, Retrospect & Prospect, Fortress 1985
- P. Hodgson & R. King, Readings in Christian Theology, SPCK 1985
- J.D. Levinson, Sinai & Zion, An Entry into Jewish Bible, Winston 1985
- G. Lohfink, Jesus and Community SPCK 1985
- F.K. McCarter, Textual Criticism, Recovering text of Hebrew Bible  
Fortress 1986
- E.V. McKnight, The Bible & the Reader (Introd to Lit.Criticism)  
Fortress 1985
- H.A. Meynell, The theology of Bernard Lonergan, Scholars Press 1986
- J. Neusner, Judaism in the Beginning of Christianity, SPCK 1984
- E.R. Obbard, Magnificat, Darton, Longman & Todd 1985
- J. Poulton, The Feast of Life, A theological Reflection, WCC 1982